Systematic Theology

A Complete Body of

Wesleyan Arminian Divinity

consisting of

Lectures on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion

by the late

Rev. Thos. O. Summers, D.D., LL.D.,

Professor of Systematic Theology in Vanderbilt University.

The Whole Arranged and Revised, With

Introduction, Copious Notes, Explanatory and Supplemental,

And a Theological Glossary,

by the

Rev. Jno. J. Tigert, M.A., S.T.B.,

Professor in Vanderbilt University.

In two volumes.

Vol. I.

Second Thousand.

Nashville, Tenn.:

Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

J. D. Barbee, Agent.

1888.

Contents

Cover
Table of Contents
Copyright and C-i-P data
EPUB Adapter's Notes
The Twenty-Five Articles
Preface
Systematic Theology.

Introduction.

Chapter I. Outline View of Theological Science.

§ 1. Systematic Theology.
§ 2. The Circle of the Theological Sciences.
§ 3. Religion and Theology.
§ 4. Expansion of the Definition of Dogmatics.
§ 5. Apologetics, Polemics, Irenics.
§ 6. Divisions of Systematic Theology.
§ 7. History and Literature of Dogmatics.

Chapter II. The Creeds and Confessions of Christendom.

§ 1. Creed, Confession, Symbol
§ 2. Beginnings of Creed in Scripture.
§ 3. Creed Statements in Early Church Writers.
§ 4. The Apostles' Creed.
§ 5. The Nicene Creed.
§ 6. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.

§ 7. “Filioque.”
§ 8. The Athanasian Creed.
§ 9. Doctrinal Standards of the Roman Church.
§ 10. Greek Doctrinal Standards.
§ 11. Confessions of the Waldenses.
§ 12. The Lutheran Standards.
§ 13. The Reformed Confessions.
§ 14. The English Articles.
§ 15. Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Churches.
§ 16. Objections to Creeds Answered.
§ 17. The Necessity for Creeds Positively Argued.
§ 18. Why Creeds Use Not the Exact Words of Scripture.
§ 19. Abuses To Be Avoided.

Book I. Theology Proper, or the Doctrine of God.

Part I. Of the Being, Perfections, and Works of God.

Chapter I. The Being of God.

§ 1. Preliminary.
§ 2. Is the Knowledge of God Innate?
§ 3. Is the Knowledge of God Intuitive?
§ 4. The A Priori Method.
§ 5. The A Posteriori Method.
§ 6. Does Nature Alone Afford the Knowledge of God?
§ 7. Conclusion from the Foregoing.
§ 8. Corroborative Testimony of Nature.
§ 9. The “Watch” Illustration of Teleology.
§ 10. Answer to the Westminster Review.
§ 11. Dr. Chalmers’s View.
§ 12. The Argument from Man.
§ 13. Analysis and Summary.

Chapter II. The Perfections of God.

I. The Unity of God.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. First, Opposed to Polytheism.
§ 3. Secondly, Opposed to Dualism
§ 4. Thirdly, Opposed to Tritheism and Tetratheism.

II. The Eternity of God.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. Scriptural Proofs.
§ 3. The Divine Existence Necessary.
§ 4. The Eternal Now.

III. The Spirituality of God.

§ 1. Polytheism Based on Anthropomorphism.
§ 2. Anthropomorphism in the Early Church.
§ 3. Is God Without “Passions?”

IV. The Omnipotence of God.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. Scriptural Proofs of Omnipotence.
§ 3. Limitation of Divine Power Disproved.
§ 4. Potestas Absoluta and Potestas Ordinata.
§ 5. Importance of the Doctrine.

V. The Wisdom of God.

§ 1. Wisdom and Omniscience.
§ 2. Omniscience.
§ 3. Omniscience Actual, not Potential, Knowledge.
§ 4. Divine Wisdom.
§ 5. Infinite Wisdom Illustrated in the Universe.
§ 6. Design Manifest in the Human Body.
§ 7. Design Evident in Man’s Spiritual Nature.
§ 8. Divine Wisdom in Redemption.

§ 9. Dr. Dwight's Definition.

VI. The Goodness of God.

§ 1. Divine Goodness Defined.
§ 2. God's Essential Goodness.
§ 3. God's Relative Goodness.
§ 4. The Divine Truth.
§ 5. The Divine Justice.
§ 6. The Divine Benevolence.

Chapter III. The Works of God.

I. Creation.

§ 1. Explanatory.
§ 2. Force, Protoplasm, Atoms, Star-dust.
§ 3. Invisible Things.
§ 4. The Angels.
§ 5. The Mosaic Cosmogony.

II. Preservation.

§ 1. Divine Providence.
§ 2. Division of the Doctrine.
§ 3. Pope's "Universal Prayer."
§ 4. The Reign of Law.
§ 5. Vital Forces.
§ 6. God's Government of the Inanimate and Irrational.
§ 7. The Moral Government of God.
§ 8. Summary.

Chapter IV. Theodicy: The Divine Glory Vindicated.

§ 1. Antitheistic Evolution: Force.
§ 2. Power, Wisdom, Goodness, Impugned.
§ 3. Cudworth's "Plastic Nature."

§ 4. An A Priori Answer: God's Power.
§ 5. The Divine Wisdom.
§ 6. The Divine Goodness.
§ 7. Paley's Teleological Exhibition of the Divine Goodness.
§ 8. Mr. J. S. Mill's Manicheism Considered.
§ 9. Imperfection Inherent in the Finite.
§ 10. Moral Evil Consistent with God's Power and Goodness,
§ 11. Objections Arising from Natural Evil Stated.
§ 12. First Answer to These Objections.
§ 13. Second Answer.
§ 14. Third Answer.
§ 15. Objection Drawn from Future Retribution Met.
§ 16. A Final Answer.

Part II. The Trinity.

Chapter I. The Doctrine Stated in Contrast with Opposing Errors.

§ 1. Positive Statement.
§ 2. Opposed to Tritheism.
§ 3. Opposed to Arianism.
§ 4. Opposed to Sabellianism.
§ 5. Opposed to Socinianism.
§ 6. Illustrations of the Trinity.
§ 7. The Trinity a Doctrine of Revealed Religion Only.

Chapter II. Scripture Proofs of the Doctrine.

§ 1. The Old Testament.
§ 2. Modern Jewish and Rationalistic Criticism.
§ 3. The New Testament Proofs.
§ 4. Antitrinitarian Objections Considered.
§ 5. Conclusion.

Book II. Christology and Objective Soteriology; or, the Doctrine of Christ and of His Salvation.

Part I. The Divinity of the Son of God.

Chapter I. The Divine Sonship of Christ.

§ 1. The Relation Defined.
§ 2. Pre-existence of the Son of God.
§ 3. The Son Bears the Names of God.
§ 4. The Attributes of Deity Ascribed to the Son.
§ 5. The Works of God Ascribed to the Son.
§ 6. The Son Receives Divine Worship.
§ 7. The Impregnable Conclusion.

Chapter II. Christ the Word and the Only-Begotten.

§ 1. The Logos.
§ 2. The Only-begotten.
§ 3. Bishop Pearson’s Summary.
§ 4. The Unigeniture of Christ.
§ 5. Why Is Christ Said To Be Begotten?
§ 6. Importance of This Doctrine.

Part II. The Incarnation of the Son of God.

Chapter I. The Humanity of Christ.

§ 1. Creed Statements Concerning the Incarnation.
§ 2. The Humanity of Christ Stated and Proved.
§ 3. Liddon on Our Lord's Humanity.

Chapter II. Of One Person and Two Natures in Christ.

§ 1. Nestorianism and Eutychianism.
§ 2. Heresies Consequent upon Eutychianism.
§ 3. The Theopaschite Heresy.
§ 4. Bishop Pearson's View.
§ 5. The Self-emptying.
§ 6. Acts xx. 28.
§ 7. Errors of Orthodox Writers Noticed.
§ 8. Views of Anglican Broad-churchmen.
§ 9. The Hypostatic Union.
§ 10. Conclusion.

Chapter III. Restatement of the Incarnation.

§ 1. The Position Defined.
§ 2. Errors Opposed.
§ 3. Design of the Incarnation.
§ 4. Importance of the Incarnation.

Part III. The Atonement.

Chapter I. The Sufferings, Crucifixion, Death, and Burial of Christ

§ 1. Introductory
§ 2. Christ Truly Suffered.
§ 3. Christ Was Crucified.

§ 4. Christ Was Dead.
§ 5. Christ Was Buried.

Chapter II. Scriptural Doctrine of Reconciliation and Sacrifice.

§ 1. Design of Christ's Humiliation.
§ 2. Christ a Sacrifice.
§ 3. Patriarchal and Mosaic Sacrifices.
§ 4. The New Testament Doctrine.

Chapter III. Extent of the Atonement.

§ 1. Scripture Proofs of Universal Atonement.
§ 2. Critical Examination of 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.
§ 3. Sixteen Conclusive Proofs of Universal Atonement.

Chapter IV. Objections to the Atonement Answered.

§ 1. Does the Atonement Reconcile God to Man?
§ 2. Sovereign Forgiveness.
§ 3. The Vinculum Between Christ's Sufferings and Our Pardon.
§ 4. The Innocent in the Place of the Guilty.
§ 5. The Divine Benevolence in Atonement.
§ 6. Universalism.

Chapter V. Erroneous Views of the Atonement.

§ 1. The Gnostic Theory.
§ 2. The Mythical, or "Satan," Theory.
§ 3. The Expediential Theory.

§ 4. The Optional Theory.
§ 5. The Anselmic or Commercial Theory.
§ 6. The Abelardian, or Moral-subjective Theory.
§ 7. The Bernardine, or Mystical-subjective Theory.

Chapter VI. A Final Statement of the Doctrine of Atonement.

§ 1. Importance of the Doctrine.
§ 2. Definition of Atonement.
§ 3. Ground of Atonement.
§ 4. The Three Aspects of Atonement.
§ 5. Propitiatory Aspect of Atonement.
§ 6. Governmental Aspect of Atonement.
§ 7. Moral Aspect of Atonement.

Book III. Christ's Resurrection, Ascension, Session, and Second Coming; and Eschatology: the Doctrine of the Last Things.

Part I. The Resurrection, Ascension, Session, and Second Coming of Christ.

Chapter I. The Nature of Christ's Resurrection Body.

§ 1. Bishops Browne and Williams on the Omitted Words.
§ 2. Errors Condemned by the Article.
§ 3. Modern Docetism Refuted.
§ 4. The Catholic Doctrine.

Chapter II. Certainty of Christ's Resurrection.

§ 1. Introductory.
§ 2. The Pregnant Presumptions.
§ 3. The Infallible Proofs.
§ 4. The Overwhelming Demonstrations.
§ 5. Importance of the Doctrine.

Chapter III. The Ascension and Session of Christ.

§ 1. The Ascension.
§ 2. Intercession and Session.
§ 3. Dr. Pope on Our Lord's Session.

Chapter IV. Return of Christ to Judgment.

§ 1. Statement of the Doctrine.
§ 2. The Second Advent of Christ.
§ 3. Why Christ is the Judge.
§ 4. Certainty of the Judgment.
§ 5. Universality of the Judgment.
§ 6. Publicity of the Judgment.
§ 7. Impartiality of the Judgment.
§ 8. Finality of the Judgment.
§ 9. Its Awards.

Part II. Eschatology.

Chapter I. Death and the Dead.

§ 1. Phenomena of Death.
§ 2. Solemnity of Death.
§ 3. Separation of the Soul and the Body.
§ 4. Disintegration and Reconstruction of the Body.
§ 5. Immortality of the Soul.
§ 6. No Sleep of the Soul.
§ 7. Development in the Separate State.
§ 8. Infants in the Intermediate State.
§ 9. Unenlightened Persons in the Intermediate State.
§ 10. No Universalism.
§ 11. No Purgatory.
§ 12. No New Probation in the Separate State.
§ 13. Degrees in the Future State.

Chapter II. No Intermediate Place.

§ 1. Paradise.
§ 2. Poetical Use of “Paradise.”
§ 3. Heaven the Place of Disembodied Spirits.

Chapter III. The Intermediate State.

§ 1. The Doctrine Stated and Proved.
§ 2. Objections to the Intermediate State Answered.
§ 3. Bishop Martensen’s Analysis.

Chapter IV. The State of Consummation, or Post-Resurrection State.

§ 1. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Sin.
§ 2. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Suffering.
§ 3. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Temptation.
§ 4. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Toil.

§ 5. Unceasing Employment.
§ 6. Good Society in Heaven.
§ 7. The Beatific Vision.
§ 8. Eternal Progression.

Chapter V. Eternal Punishment.

§ 1. Terms Rendered Hell in the Authorized Version.
§ 2. The Terms Rendered Damn—Damnation—Damnable.
§ 3. The Terms Rendered Eternity—Everlasting—Eternal.

Book IV. Pneumatology and Subjective Soteriology; or, the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of his Administration of Redemption.

Chapter I. The Procession of the Holy Ghost.

§ 1. Creed Statements.
§ 2. The Name of the Third Person of the Trinity.
§ 3. The Doctrine of the Spirit’s Procession.
§ 4. Procession Defined.
§ 5. The Twofold Procession: the Ontological.
§ 6. The Economical Procession.
§ 7. The Spirit’s Relation to Christ’s Earthly Career.
§ 8. The Dispensation of the Spirit.
§ 9. The Paraclete.
§ 10. The Spirit of the Truth.
§ 11. The Spirit’s Moral Influence.

Chapter II. Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

§ 1. Personality of the Holy Ghost.
§ 2. Divinity of the Holy Ghost.
§ 3. Importance of This Article.

Chapter III. The Dispensation of the Spirit.

§ 1. Scriptural Notion of the Spirit’s Dispensation.
§ 2. The New Dispensation.
§ 3. Edification of the Church.

Chapter IV. The Witness of the Spirit.

§ 1. Definition and Method.
§ 2. Universality of the Spirit’s Operation.
§ 3. The Witness.
§ 4. Presumptions.
§ 5. Proofs.
§ 6. Demonstrations.

Book V. Bibliology; or, The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures.

Part I. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

The Names of the Canonical Books.

Chapter I. The Pertinency and Genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

§ 1. Preliminary.
§ 2. Pertinency of the Holy Scriptures.
§ 3. Genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

Chapter II. Authenticity of the Holy Scriptures.

I. Presumptions in Favor of Authenticity.

§ 1. Revelation (1) Necessary, (2) Possible, (3) Probable.
§ 2. Ethnic Sacred Books.
§ 3. The Science of Comparative Religion.
§ 4. Anticipations Concerning the Character of a Divine Revelation.
§ 5. The Presumptions Imply Written Revelation.
§ 6. The Character of the Sacred Writers.

II. Proofs of Authenticity: Revelation and Inspiration.

§ 1. Revelation and Inspiration Defined and Discriminated.
§ 2. The Sacred Writers Organs of Divine Revelation.
§ 3. Province of Inspiration.
§ 4. The Sacred Writers Claim Inspiration.
§ 5. Critical Examination of 2 Tim. iii. 15–17.
§ 6. Exposition of 2 Peter i. 19–21.
§ 7. Inspiration Identical in the Two Testaments.
§ 8. Rationalistic Theory of Inspiration.
§ 9. Mechanical Theory of Inspiration.
§ 10. The Dynamic Theory of Inspiration.

III. Demonstrations of Authenticity.

§ 1. Miracles: Definition and Scriptural Idea.
§ 2. Peculiarities of the Miracles of Scripture.

§ 3. Objections to Miracles Considered.
§ 4. Prophecy Defined.
§ 5. Characteristics of Scripture Prophecies.
§ 6. Objections Answered.
§ 7. The Work and Witness of the Holy Spirit.
§ 8. Conclusion.

Chapter III. Exhaustiveness of the Holy Scriptures.

§ 1. No Redundancy in the Holy Scriptures.
§ 2. No Deficiency in the Holy Scriptures.

I. The Apocrypha.

§ 1. The Books So Designated.
§ 2. Reasons for Rejection of the Apocryphal Books.

II. Tradition.

§ 1. Tradition Defined.
§ 2. Tradition Excluded and Forbidden by the Scriptures.
§ 3. Tradition Uncertain and Useless.
§ 4. Many Traditions Puerile.
§ 5. Many Traditions False.
§ 6. Many Traditions Heretical.
§ 7. Does Tradition Supply the Canon of Scripture?
§ 8. Is Tradition Our Authority for the Lord's-day?
§ 9. Is Tradition the Warrant for Infant Baptism?
§ 10. Is Tradition the Warrant for Episcopacy?

III. Unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

§ 1. Who are the Fathers?
§ 2. The Unanimous Consent.

IV. The Decisions of Councils.

§ 1. What Ecclesiastical Synods are Councils?

§ 2. The Authority of the Roman Church and Her Councils.

V. The Bulls of Popes.
VI. The Dicta of the Priests.
Conclusion.

§ 1. Errors of the Anglicans.
§ 2. Attributes or Marks of the Bible.
§ 3. Summary and Conclusion.

Part II. Of the Old Testament.

Chapter I. Harmony of the Old and New Testaments.

§ 1. Opposed to Dualistic Errors.
§ 2. The Old Testament Fully Indorsed in the New.
§ 3. Christ in the Old Testament.

Chapter II. Eternal Life Revealed in the Old Testament.

§ 1. Warburton’s “Divine Legation of Moses.”
§ 2. Moses’s Design in the Composition of Genesis.
§ 3. Moses’s Design in the Other Books of the Pentateuch.
§ 4. The Book of Job.
§ 5. The Psalms.
§ 6. The Prophets.
§ 7. Inconsistency of Those Who Receive the New Testament.
§ 8. Objections Founded on Old Testament Passages Refuted.

Chapter III. Abolition of Jewish Ceremonial and Civil Law.

§ 1. Summary of These Laws.
§ 2. The Ceremonial Law Temporary.
§ 3. The Political or Civil Institute.

Chapter IV. Eternal Obligation of the Moral Law.

§ 1. The Ten Commandments.
§ 2. Moral and Positive Precepts Discriminated.
§ 3. The Ten Commandments Distinguished from the Political Code.
§ 4. Christian Functions of the Moral Law.
§ 5. Antinomianism Condemned.

Page list

3
4
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116

157
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199

200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239

240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279

280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321

404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445

526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552

Guide

1. Start of Text

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1888,
BY THE BOOK AGENTS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

[This adaptation © 2026 somercet, released under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 license (CC BY-SA 4.0).]

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Names:

I. Summers, Thomas Osmond, 1812–1882, author.
II. Tigert, John James III, 1856–1906, editor, writer of preface.

Title: Systematic Theology : a complete body of Wesleyan Arminian divinity consisting of lectures on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion, vol. i. / Rev. Thos. O. Summers. 552 pages. Electronic.
Description: EPUB adaptation of a public domain book. | Original: Nashville, Tenn.: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1888.
Identifiers: EPUB UUID: a44bce53-a975-4c43-bc1b-b28145c74dc1
Classification: LCC BX 5331 .S846 1888 v.1
Subjects: LCSH:

1. Theology, Doctrinal—Methodist authors.
2. Arminianism.

EPUB Adapter's Notes

Systematic Theology goes through each of Methodism's Twenty-Five Articles of Religion in a clear and thorough manner. Both authors were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, both taught at Vanderbilt University: Bishop John James Tigert III (1856–1906) adapted the lecture notes of his former teacher, the late Rev. Thomas Osmond Summers (1812–1882), into textbook form.

Rev. Summers was born in Dorset, England, orphaned young, then taken up by an aunt and raised an Independent (Congregationalist, and so Calvinist). He emigrated to the United States in 1830, soon becaming a Methodist and a fervent defender of Wesleyan Arminianism. He was an active member of the General Conference for decades and, as editor of the MECS Publishing House, he was a powerhouse: preaching, teaching, editing multiple Methodist periodicals, and writing hundreds of books. The *Systematic Theology*, not quite directly from his own hands, may not be his *magnum opus*, as his especial concern was for the hymnal, baptism, and the liturgy. R. Matthew Sigler, in his *Methodist Worship: Mediating the Wesleyan Liturgical Heritage*, noted that Nolan Harmon drew upon Summers' research for his own seminal 1926 study of Methodist historical liturgics.

This EPUB was made by cleaning and formatting the OCR text from the 1888 edition. I thank archive.org for making the book available to the public, and this considerably cleaner, smaller, and more navigable version has since joined it there.

Various typographical errors were corrected, such as removing an 'l' from 'fulfillment.' Descartes' name was reduced from two words to one (the 19th C. saw many attempts to 'correct' orthography, often based on early and incomplete research), and the Monophysite John Ascusnages had the 's' added to the first instance of his name.

Dehyphenating the printed words followed a strict rule: all latter halves were promoted whence they started, to the previous line *or page*.

This file was validated as EPUB 3.3 by EPUBCheck v. 5.3.0. The only errors were: the script used to generate the `toc.xhtml` file

uses LIs containing only OLs to place certain elements. This passed XHTML5 validation but EPUBcheck seems to be more strict. I will correct this in a future version.

—somercet

The Twenty-Five Articles

Whereas this entire book is based upon the Methodist Articles of Religion, but had no copy of them in one place for reference, and its organization scatters them about the different books, parts and chapters, this editor thought it meet to include them, with links to the appropriate chapters, for convenience.

Taken from *The Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1889.

—*somercet*

I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very man.

The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures —that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

III. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

IV. Of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

V. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scriptures, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

The Names of the Canonical Books.

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The First Book of Samuel, The Second Book of Samuel, The First Book of Kings, The Second Book of Kings, The First Book of Chronicles, The Second Book of Chronicles, The Book of Ezra, The Book of Nehemiah, The Book of Esther, The Book of Job, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less. All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

VI. Of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity, to be received in any Commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

VII. Of Original or Birth Sin.

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

VIII. Of Free-Will.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

IX. Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

X. Of Good Works.

Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.

XI. Of Works of Supererogation.

Voluntary works, besides over and above God's

commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

XII. Of Sin after Justification.

Not every sin willingly committed after justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after justification: after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And, therefore, they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

XIII. Of the Church.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

XIV. Of Purgatory.

The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshiping and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the word of God.

XV. Of Speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the people understand.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public prayer in the

church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people.

XVI. Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good-will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called sacraments—that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the *corrupt* following of the apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves condemnation as St. Paul saith, I Cor. xi. 29.

XVII. Of Baptism.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

XVIII. Of the Lord's Supper.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same,

the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten, in the Supper, is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped.

XIX. Of Both Kinds.

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike.

XX. Of the One Oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross.

The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.

XXI. Of the Marriage of Ministers.

The ministers of Christ are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christians, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve best to godliness.

XXII. Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.

It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the Church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

Every particular Church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.

XXIII. Of the Rulers of the United States of America.

The President, the Congress, the general assemblies, the governors, and the councils of state, as the delegates of the people, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitution of their respective States. And the said States are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

(As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and, therefore, it is expected that all our preachers and people, who may be under any foreign government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects.)

XXIV. Of Christian Men's Goods.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as

he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor according to his ability.

XXV. Of a Christian Man's Oath.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

Preface

3

For conservatism, orthodoxy, broad theological scholarship, and, particularly, for careful, conscientious, and patient study of all the elements of the Arminian system of theology—the system which gave such complete satisfaction to his head and heart—Dr. Summers was confessedly without a superior in the ranks of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. From the separate organization of the Church until his death, he stood over Hymnbook and Discipline and theological publications, as the guardian of orthodoxy, saving the Church from the taint of many an incipient heresy. For seven consecutive years (1875–1882) the material collected in this work was read as a series of lectures before the theological students of Vanderbilt University. Throughout this period of the active discharge of the duties of his chair, Dr. Summers was at work with untiring diligence, recasting, amending, and enlarging his course of instruction. All the lectures were subjected to repeated revision, and many portions to frequent rewriting. It may well be supposed that this instructed scribe fairly got his mind expressed upon the great topics of Systematic Theology, concerning which the studies of a life-time so well qualified him to pronounce. A conviction of the permanent value of results thus wrought out, and of the pressing need for such a body of divinity in the Church, has led to the preparation of these volumes.

This work is at once a complete system of Wesleyan Arminian divinity and an exhaustive commentary on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion which embody the doctrinal views of American Methodists. It is believed to answer a twofold purpose: *first*, It may be presented to the theological world as a reliable, full,

4

and, in some sense, authoritative, exposition of Evangelical Arminianism as developed within the limits of Southern Methodism; and, *secondly*, It may serve as a standard text and reference-book for ministers of religion and for students of divinity throughout the Connection. Every Church owes it to itself to provide the former;

and no pains have been spared to adapt the publication to the latter use. To this end the matter has been carefully distributed into Books, Parts, Chapters, and Sections, to all of which it has been the aim to prefix pertinent and suggestive titles, these titles being finally gathered up into an exhaustive analytical table of contents. For this part of the work, as well as the appended glossary of theological terms, the writer of this preface is alone responsible.

In the revision of Dr. Summers's MS., it was found necessary, in order to bring the publication as nearly as possible abreast of recent scholarship, to make some additions. These additions, whether prepared by the present writer or selected from standard authorities (of whom the learned Wesleyan theologian, Dr. Pope, has been the chief), are always indicated. When inserted in the body of the text, they are inclosed in square brackets, thus: [ ]. When added as foot-notes, they are signed with the initial, "T." There are two exceptions, however, to these rules. Two entire chapters, Chapter I. of the Introduction, and Chapter II., Part I., Book III., on the "Certainty of Christ's Resurrection," were inserted without using the brackets, or appending the initial to the foot-notes occurring in them.

The preparation of these volumes has been a labor of love. By unceasing kindnesses did Dr. Summers endear himself to that student of his to whose lot it has fallen to prepare for the press this last gift of his departed instructor to the Church he loved and served so well. May God's blessing give the work a mission of real usefulness.

J. J. T.

Vanderbilt University,
Christmas Eve, 1887.

Systematic Theology.

Introduction.

Chapter I. Outline View of Theological Science.

§ 1. Systematic Theology.

19
Systematic theology may here be compendiously defined as the scientific form of the truths of revelation. The literal significance of the term theology, as well as its earlier and more exact usage, would confine it to the immediate doctrine concerning God, his existence, nature, and perfections; but an adequate definition of theology as the science of religion, and as co-extensive with divinity, must include, in addition to the doctrine of God, the doctrine of divine things. So far as revealed truths are doctrinal—*i. e.* proposed to man for belief—systematic theology becomes dogmatics; so far as these truths are practical—*i. e.*, regulative of human conduct—systematic theology resolves itself into Christian ethics, or moral theology.

§ 2. The Circle of the Theological Sciences.

Various divisions of the whole field of theological research have been proposed, and have found wider or narrower adoption among theologians.[1]

20
Schleiermacher divides theology generally into (1) philosophical, (2) historical, and (3) practical. To philosophical theology are assigned (1) apologetics, or the vindication of the divine revelation contained in the Scriptures, and the defense of the Christian system against all external or non-Christian attacks; and (2) polemics, or the establishment of Christian truth through the refutation of all heterodox systems, doctrinal heresies, and local or individual errors, as developed within the limits of the Christian Church itself. Historical theology embraces (1) exegetics, or acquaintance with original Christianity, the records of which remain as a perpetual deposit in the Church, including Biblical archaeology, introduction, criticism, and interpretation—in short, Biblical theology in the

widest sense, as the perfect fruit of the combination of all exegetical study; (2) ecclesiastical history, or an account of the subsequent course, development, and extension of Christianity, with due prominence given to the history of doctrines; (3) the presentation of the present state of Christianity (*a*) as to doctrine (dogmatics), (*b*) as to general welfare and relations (statistics). Practical theology includes (1) worship (liturgies), homiletics, and the pastoral care; (2) Church government.

Godet classifies theology as (1) speculative, or the knowledge of salvation; and (2) practical, or the art of saving men. Under the first division he places (1) exegetical, (2) dogmatic, and (3) historical theology; under the second (1) Church government, (2) missions, and (3) apologetics.

Dr. W. F. Warren, of Boston University, following Schleiermacher, but making a distinct advance and improvement upon him, suggests the following distribution: 1. The Church in its *origin* in time, including (1) introduction; (2) Biblical theology; (3) Biblical history, archaeology, etc. 2. The Church in its development in time, including (1) doctrine history; (2) Church history; (3) dogmatics and polemics; and (4) Church government.

3. The Church in its *final consummation*, which would embrace the teachings of revelation concerning the future development of the Church to the end of time; and, finally, eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things—namely, death, the intermediate state, resurrection, judgment, heaven, and hell.

These three systems—German, French, American—afford sufficient illustration of the current distribution of the vast materials of theology into appropriate subordinate sciences, and of the arrangement and interdependence of these sciences themselves. For all the practical purposes of the student, the time-honored division of theology into (1) exegetical, (2) historical, (3) systematic, and (4) practical will be found the most useful. The schemes noted are sagacious and suggestive. This last is comprehensive, perspicuous, and logical, and has the additional advantage of having become familiar through its general adoption by theological instructors and writers. The name of each division is sufficiently indicative of the studies included in it.

§ 3. Religion and Theology.

Kant defines religion as *the acknowledgment of our duties as divine commands*.[2] According to Hagenbach, religion, piety, the fear of God, godliness, is "primarily neither knowledge nor action, but rather a definite state of feeling, which is to be developed into a clear and rational consciousness through the exercise of intelligent reflection, and into a firmly established disposition through the moral determination of the will; as the true principle of life, it is to permeate the whole inner man, and to manifest itself externally as the highest fruitage of human nature."[3]

In this definition may plainly be discerned the influence of Schleiermacher's theology of feeling, but for our present purpose it may be accepted as approximately correct. Now theology is first of all science, knowledge. "Theology," says Dr. Knapp, "is the knowledge of God carried to the highest degree of perfection in respect to correctness, clearness, and evidence of which it is susceptible in this world; and a theologian or divine is one who not only understands himself the doctrines of religion, but is able to explain, prove, and defend them, and teach them to others."[4] Theology has revealed truth, indeed, for its subject-matter, but it is, nevertheless, a *human science of divine things*, and as such is neither infallible nor necessary to salvation. All Churches make a distinction between the clergy and laity with respect to required subscription to articles of faith, and it is possible for an unlettered Christian man devoutly to reverence Father, Son, and Holy Spirit without being able to grasp the scientific doctrine of the Trinity, and to rely upon the divine sacrifice and mediation of Christ without theological instruction concerning atonement and the person of Christ. On the other hand, the most learned theologian may be a bad man, and fail of present or eternal salvation. Dr. Pope's representation ("Compendium of Christian Theology," Vol. I., p. 25) of religion as an art corresponding to theology as its *science* seems, therefore, hardly correct; the connection between the two is not constant and necessary. While religious life is not dependent upon the copiousness and precision of theological scholarship, the theologian who would work out the largest results in his science must himself have deep experience of the things of

God. “That man is not the best theologian,” says J. A. Turretin, “who is the greatest disputant; but he who exhibits an exemplary life himself, and who teaches others to be exemplary in their lives. In things necessary to salvation, let every man become his own theologian.”

§ 4. Expansion of the Definition of Dogmatics.

The definition of systematic theology, or dogmatics—for an old and widely prevalent usage regards the two terms as practically synonymous—contained in § 1 may on first consideration appear to be too exclusively Biblical, either as implying the retention

of the exact form of Biblical statement and treatment, or as referring the whole of dogmatics to the Bible as its *only* source, to the exclusion of *reason*, *nature*, and *history*. But this is not the case.

1. Let us consider the *form* which systematic theology gives to Christian truth. Biblical theology and Biblical dogmatics are very intimately related, and, consequently, are easily confounded. The definition is not Biblical as opposed to dogmatic, for the relation of Biblical theology to dogmatics is that of *the complete collection of materials to the organized system*; and the transformation from exegetical to dogmatic form is implied in the designation of dogmatics as scientific. Science involves not simply the study of facts or truths in the order in which these are brought to our notice, but generalization from particulars, classification of materials, and systematic exposition. Biblical and systematic theology are one, inasmuch as they both have the truths of Scripture for their subject-matter; they differ in their methods of treatment. The former endeavors to present doctrine as it lies in the Scriptures, and to trace its individual treatment in, and development through, the various books of the inspired record. Accordingly, in the Old Testament it presents us with patriarchal, Mosaic, and prophetical theologies; and in the New with Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine types of doctrine. Its methods are purely exegetical and rigidly historical; it is consequently the indispensable basis of a reliable and catholic system of Bible dogmatics. It persistently avoids all dogmatic or confessional predilections. Systematic theology initially demonstrates or assumes, as the outcome of the previous

investigations of apologetics, the inspiration, sufficiency, and infallible authority of the Scriptures, and then arranges and expounds all Bible truths with this character impressed upon them. But Biblical theology does not take inspiration or infallibility, necessary consistency and freedom from error, for a beginning point or formative principle; but, adhering strictly to exegetical and historical methods—which may and do, indeed, demonstrate inspiration—works out the exact doctrinal contents of each document of the Bible, and arrives at its own appropriate results. Systematic theology takes this same matter, and, in the use of both inductive and deductive methods, transforms it into the organized or dogmatic form. All the laws of thought and powers

of intellect, brought into legitimate exercise in effecting this change of form, are included in, and approved by, the definition.

> The result, whether by analysis or synthesis, is the scientific presentation of each doctrine and class of doctrine, and the entire compass of theology. In this way—that is, by the rigorous processes of induction and deduction—systematic theology arrives at a clear and distinct apprehension of every article of the faith. For instance, its doctrine of sin is the result of a wide and exhaustive examination of a large number of testimonies in Scripture and experience, which force conviction on the mind that one, and one only, theory can account for all the facts. The same may be said of its doctrine of the person of Christ, which is inductively established by a comparison of many passages, none of which individually contain a formal statement. ... In common with all the sciences, theology has its phraseology of conventions—partly of scriptural precedent or suggestion, partly of human appointment. Conventional terms are necessary in all knowledge; the symbols of ideas once settled are, and ought to be, unchangeable. The systematic arrangement of divine truth requires them, and has enlisted them in great variety. It has its precise technical terminology, the fixing of which has been the result of sound inductive processes, and the accurate maintenance of which gives its precision to our study. Revelation, Inspiration, Scripture, Faith, Trinity, Substance, Person, are instances of terms which have their established conventional meaning.[5]

2. As to the *sources* of dogmatics, the definition is not Biblical in the sense of excluding *reason* and *nature* as affording proper materials for the use of theology. The primitive revelations of God in external nature, and in the mind and conscience of man, commonly summarized in treatises on natural theology, are expressly acknowledged and absorbed by the complementary,

corrective, and final revelation. “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork,” etc. (Ps. xix. 1–6.) “Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.” (Acts xiv. 17.; *cf.* Acts xvii. 27, 28.) “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.” (Rom. i. 20.; *cf.* Rom. ii. 14, 15.)

3. Again, this Biblical definition is not exclusive of a proper historical treatment of the doctrines of revealed truth. Inasmuch as the history of doctrines is not only helpful, but necessary to the attainment of our own final scientific or dogmatic form, we are entitled to its use. This use of doctrinal history

should not, however, be given a prominent place in the definition, as it is tributary and subordinate to the specific ends sought, and systematic theology should not be made to usurp the large place assigned to historical. Exegetical or Biblical theology, in its widest sense, is the great furnisher of materials for dogmatics, and historical theology is the department of investigation chiefly auxiliary to intelligent dogmatic study; but the dogmatic theologian is not authorized to trespass upon the peculiar province of either.[6]

4. Finally, while the definition implies all this, it divorces dogmatics from an unholy alliance with, and servile dependence upon, the various human forms of speculative and rationalistic philosophy that have so often been the medium of the interpretation of Scripture and of the authoritative formation of dogma. Philosophy, beyond doubt, has its separate and valid functions and ends, and should be an intimate and inseparable companion of theology; but “they who fancy that religion will ever prostrate itself before philosophy, and transfer to it the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” says Steffensen, “are certainly very silly;” nor, on the other hand, does theology claim to be the mistress of philosophy. When the tasks of philosophy shall have been completed, and a final form obtained, the result will of course be in entire harmony with revelation, since the truth of God is one; but particular philosophical systems have not, as yet, furnished abiding foundations for theology. Christian theology first accepted Platonism, among the ancient systems of Greek philosophy, and was

very largely colored by it. This system was subsequently abandoned for the Aristotelian, which, through the influence of the mediaeval schoolmen, became universal. Since the reformation have flourished the philosophical systems of Descartes and Spinoza, Leibnitz and Wolf, Kant and Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, Schopenhauer and Hartmann. Theological belief, resting on the authority of Wolf's dogmatism, was destroyed by Kant's criticism, and Kantian philosophical theology was in turn seriously modified by the absolute idealism of Fichte, and finally deprived of its foundation by the almost universally dominant Hegelianism. But the reign of Hegel's philosophy

of the absolute proved transient also, for soon German thinkers began to plunge into the chaos of Schopenhauer's and Hartmann's pessimism. Such has been the dreary history. These philosophical theologies, often confessedly pantheistic, and sometimes really anti-Christian and atheistic, have been the curse of much recent theological learning in Germany. In scientific theology, as well as in practical religion, our faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.

§ 5. Apologetics, Polemics, Irenics.

"Dogmatics," says Sack, "is Christian doctrine as adapted to Christian thinkers, implying friendliness on their part; apologetics is Christian doctrine in a form adapted to heathen thinkers, and presumes hostility on their part; and polemics adapts the doctrine to the state of heretical Christian thinkers, proceeding on the supposition of dissatisfaction on their part." This is very clearly and accurately stated. A given doctrine will of course fall to be apologetically treated, if the state of the unbelieving world demands it; but, in general, apologetics constitutes the great introductory section of dogmatics. In this treatise, the order of whose topics is fixed by the order of the Articles of the Confession of which it is an exposition, the matter usually embraced in apologetics will be largely included in Book V., in which the Christian doctrine concerning the Scriptures will be expounded and defended.

On the functions of polemics and irenics we may appropriate the view of Hagenbach:

While dogmatics is governed by apologetical motives on the one hand, its entire substance is pervaded by polemical considerations on the other. That is to say, it has continually to recognize confessional contrasts, and to bring into view what is peculiar in the confession which it professes to support. It thus receives the confessional stamp without which it would cease to be the dogmatics of a particular Church. It has, moreover, to reprove what is erroneous and morbid in the Church itself, and to present the unimpaired rule of doctrine in opposition to dogmatical perversions. This polemical feature does not, however, exclude the *irenical*, whose aim it is to discover the measure of truth in the keeping of opposing parties, and to point out the conditions upon which a gradual understanding, and ultimately a true and lasting reconciliation, of existing contrasts may be brought about. Neither polemics nor irenics is therefore to be regarded as a separate branch of theological study, but simply as special sides of the department of dogmatics.7

§ 6. Divisions of Systematic Theology.

27
In the work upon which we are now entering the order in which the great subjects of systematic theology shall be taken up is determined for us by the arrangement of the Twenty-Five Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which are here expounded in their sequence. This order, though not precisely that pursued in most modern treatises on dogmatics, will be found a by no means unnatural one, but, on the contrary, excellently adapted to the present purpose. Certainly more would be lost in perspicuity than gained in scientific rigor by an attempted transposition.

Moreover the articles themselves are easily thrown into certain great groups, and afford a sufficient basis for the development and exposition of all the cardinal doctrines of divinity.

Our material readily disposes itself into eight books.

Book I. will treat of Theology Proper, the doctrine of the being, perfections, and works of God, together with that of the Trinity, corresponding with Article I. of the Confession.

Book II. will treat of Christology (from Χριστός, Christ, Messiah, Anointed, and λόγος, discourse), the doctrine of the Person of Christ, and also of Objective Soteriology (from *σωτηρία*, salvation, and λόγος), or the work which Christ accomplished for our redemption. The topics of this book are set forth in Article II.

Book III. will treat of Christ's Resurrection; his Second Coming; and Eschatology (ἔσχατος, last), the doctrine of the last things. These subjects are embraced in Article III.

Book IV. will be devoted to Pneumatology (πνεῦμα, spirit), the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and Subjective Soteriology, or the process of salvation as accomplished in the experience of the believer by the operation of the Holy Ghost—corresponding to Article IV. of the Confession.

Book V. will treat of Bibliology (βιβλίον, diminutive of βιβλος, book), the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which corresponds in the main with apologetics or Christian evidences, and will include the topics defined in Articles V. and VI.

Book VI. will occupy itself with Anthropology (ἄνθρωπος, man), the doctrine of man as created, fallen, and redeemed, including Hamartiology (ἁμαρτία, sin), or the doctrine of sin. This book will discuss all the topics suggested in Articles VII., VIII., IX., X., XI., and XII.

Book VII. will expound the principles of Ecclesiology (ἐκκλησία, Church), or the doctrine of the Christian Church, with its sacraments and ministry, embracing all the matter of Articles XIII., XIV., XV., XVI., XVII., XVIII., XIX., XX., XXI., and XXII.

Finally, Book VIII. will discuss Christian Ethics or Moral Theology upon the basis of Articles XXIII., XXIV., and XXV.

It has been well remarked that the scriptural doctrine concerning the Trinity and the Person of Christ has been formulated mainly within the limits of the Greek Church; the doctrine concerning man, within the Latin Church; and the doctrine of salvation—justification and its concomitants—has been the task successfully achieved by the Teutonic, or Protestant, Church.

§ 7. History and Literature of Dogmatics.

Origen and Augustin showed decided dogmatic tendencies. The first constructor of a regular system was John of Damascus. Roscellin, Abelard, and Anselm sought a philosophical reconciliation of knowledge and faith. Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas composed those scholastic systems called *Summae*. Among the Franciscans there arose, in opposition to

the Dominican Thomists, the mystical school of Bonaventura and the dialectic school of John Duns Scotus. Melancthon began the statement of dogma among the Lutherans with his *Loci Communes* (1521). John Calvin brought the Reformed Church under similar obligations by his "Institutes" (1535), which may be said to be the standard of Scotch, English, Irish, and American Presbyterians and Independents. American Presbyterians also possess the great work on "Systematic Theology" of Dr. Charles Hodge, the excellent "Outlines of Theology," by Dr. A. A. Hodge, and the "System of Christian Theology," by Dr. H. B. Smith. Among Methodists, the great standard has been Watson's "Theological Institutes," published in 1823. The most modern, scholarly, and complete statement of Methodist doctrine is Dr. W. B. Pope's "Compendium of Christian Theology." Among Methodist writings, mention should also be made of Dr. Raymond's "Systematic Theology" and Dr. Ralston's "Elements of Divinity," both of which have proved useful. Of foreign works, translated and easily accessible, attention may be called to the "Christian Theology" of Dr. G. C. Knapp, the "Christian Dogmatics" of Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee, and the work bearing the same title by the Danish Bishop Martensen.

---

1. English and American theological literature has been singularly deficient in treatises upon the number and distribution of the theological sciences, and the order and method of their study. Some practical suggestions concerning studies suitable for the minister and theologian, and the formation of studious habits, are usually embraced in books on pastoral theology; but there is no attempt at scientific or exhaustive treatment. A posthumous volume on Theological Encyclopedia, compiled from the seminary lectures of Dr. McClintock, was published in 1878; and Dr. Henry B. Smith began, but did not live to complete, a more elaborate treatise. In some of the earlier issues of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Professor E. A. Park translated a few of Tholuck's lectures on Methodology. Professor W. G. T. Shedd has also written an essay on "The Method and Influence of Theological Studies." This is about the sum of our express American literature in this department. In view of this evident poverty, some disappointment must be confessed that Drs. Crooks and Hurst did not give themselves time to collect the materials and furnish an original contribution to the literature of

Encyclopedia and Methodology. Of course we know that they were very well able to do this, but such knowledge only intensifies the disappointment. Since, however, a selection was to be made among the numerous German authors, Hagenbach was doubtless a most judicious choice. Crooks and Hurst's edition of Hagenbach is the best and most complete work on this subject accessible to the American student.↩

2. As is well known, the etymology of *religion* is dubious. Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*, ii. 28) derives it from *relegere* (to go over again in thought or speech, to ponder, to consider); while the Christian father, Lactantius (Div. Inst., iv. 28), expressly rejects this etymology of Cicero's, and derives the term from *religare* (to bind again).↩
3. Crooks and Hurst's "Theo. Ency. and Meth.," p. 25. Karl R. Hagenbach (1801–1874) was an earnest and able expounder of the "mediation" theology. Reared in a Church in which the extremest orthodoxy held undisputed sway, and greatly influenced in his theological development by the writings of Herder, and the academical instructions of Lücke, at Bonn; of Schleiermacher and Neander, whom he regarded as his masters while at Berlin; and of DeWette, at Basle, he attained a balance of the critical, conservative, and constructive faculties which gave him special qualifications for his duties as a theological instructor when he was called to be *professor ordinarius* at Basle in 1829.↩
4. "Christian Theology," p. 26.↩
5. Dr. W. B. Pope, "Compendium of Christian Theology," Vol. I., pp. 26, 30.↩
6. One of the latest, as well as one of the best, histories of Christian doctrine is that of Professor H. C. Sheldon, of Boston University. New York: Harper & Brothers. 2 vols., 8vo., 1886.↩
7. "Theo. Ency. and Meth.," pp, 413, 414.↩

Chapter II. The Creeds and Confessions of Christendom.

§ 1. Creed, Confession, Symbol

29
There are three terms in common use to designate the articles of faith acknowledged by Christians. The first is *creed*, from the Latin *credo*, the first word of the Apostles' Creed, meaning "I believe." This denotes a concise formulary. The second is *confession*, from the Latin *confessio*, which is the rendering of ὁμολογία in 1 Timothy vi. 13.[1] This generally designates a formulary more extended and developed. The third is *symbol*, from σύμβολον, the watch-word by which soldiers were recognized (*tessera militaris*), which is used indifferently of the creed or the confession.

§ 2. Beginnings of Creed in Scripture.

The symbolic norm, or nucleus, is found in Acts viii. 37—that passage being recognized as genuine: "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."[2] When the eunuch uttered this *credo*, when he made this "good confession," Philip baptized him. This is a short creed, but, properly understood, it embraces every thing necessary to be believed in order to salvation. To this effect is the language of

30
the Apostle Paul: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved, for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. x. 9, 10.) "The heart" is "the inward man," the soul, comprehending intellect, will, and affections; "the mouth" is "the outward man," or that which gives outward expression to the inward experience. Bishop Pearson well says:

> The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the soul; an act

of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same. The confession of the mouth is an external signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgment of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. The ear receiveth the word; "faith cometh by hearing" (Rom. x. 17); the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Matt. xii. 34); in the heart faith is seated; with the tongue confession is made; between these two salvation is completed. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 9.) This faith of the heart every one ought and is presumed to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make when he pronounceth these words of the creed, "*I believe;*" and if true, he may with comfort say, "The word of faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart" (Rom. x. 8); first in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the Prophet David, "I have believed, and therefore have I spoken." (Ps. cxvi. 10.)

This confession was solemnly made in baptism, and it is to this apparently that Peter alludes in 1 Peter iii. 21: "Baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."[3]

§ 3. Creed Statements in Early Church Writers.

When false doctrines were introduced into the Church it was deemed expedient to go more into detail, so as to affirm the true doctrines in opposition to the false.

Watson says:

Except a single sentence in one of the Ignatian Epistles (A.D. 180), which relates exclusively to the reality of Christ's personality and suffering, in opposition to the *Docetae*, the earliest document of this kind is to be found in the writings of Irenaeus, who flourished toward the end of the second century. In his treatise

against heresies this father affirms that "the faith of the Church planted throughout the whole world," consisted in the belief of "one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth and sea and all that are in them; and one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and the Holy Spirit, who foretold through the prophets the dispensations and advents, and generation by the Virgin, and the passion,

and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension in the flesh into heaven of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord, and his appearing from heaven in the glory of the Father to unite together all things under one head, and to raise every individual of the human race; that unto Christ Jesus, our Lord and God and Saviour and King, every knee may bow and every tongue confess; that he may pronounce just sentence upon all."

Similar statements occur in the works of Tertullian (A.D. 200), who says:

This is the sole, immovable, irreformable rule of faith—namely, to believe in the only God Almighty, maker of the world; and his son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day raised from the dead, received into heaven, now sitting at the right hand of the Father, about to come and judge the quick and the dead, by the resurrection also of the flesh.

There are similar summaries of doctrine in the works of Origen (A.D. 220), *e. g.*:

We believe that there is one God, who created all things, and framed and made all things to exist out of nothing. We must also believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and in all the truth concerning his deity and humanity; and we must likewise believe in the Holy Spirit; and that, being free agents, we shall be punished for the things in which we sin, and rewarded for those in which we do well.

Cyprian says the *Symboli Lex*—law of the creed, or the formula to which assent was required at baptism—was this: "Dost thou believe in God the Father, Christ the Son, the Holy Spirit, the remission of sins, and eternal life through the holy Church?" This was called by Novatian *regula veritatis*—the rule of truth.

§ 4. The Apostles' Creed.

Out of such symbols originated the so-called Apostles' Creed. As there are twelve articles in this Creed, Rufinus reports a fable to the effect that after the resurrection of Christ, while the apostles were still at Jerusalem, they met together and agreed upon this symbol. Some say that this word, derived from *συμβάλλειν*, alludes to the custom of several persons meeting together to eat a common meal, each one contributing his share of the repast. So the apostles met together, and each contributed an article to compose this symbol. But if the apostles had composed this Creed it would have

been embodied in their writings, or at least it would have been regarded with so much veneration that the Fathers would not have substituted for it other symbols. It cannot

be traced farther back than the third century. With the exception of the interpolated clause, “he descended into hell,” it is found, with slight variations, in the works of Ambrose and Rufinus, and is spoken of by them as in common use in their day. It has held its place as “The Creed of Christendom,” into which the members of the Church are baptized—nearly all sects and parties recognizing its Scriptural character. It is embodied in our baptismal service, and in all our catechisms, the interpolated clause, of the descent into hell, being properly canceled.

§ 5. The Nicene Creed.

The so-called Nicene Creed is next in order and importance. It was set forth in opposition to Arianism and other errors, by the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. It is found in the letter of Eusebius Pamphilus to his diocese of Cesarea, together with the slightly different Eusebian Confession. It is as follows:

> We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father—that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God; Light of Light; very God of very God; begotten, not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both the things in heaven and the things in earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, and was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day; he ascended into heaven; and cometh to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit. But the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church anathematizes those who say there was a time when the Son was not, or that he was not before he was begotten, or that he was made of things not existing, or who say that the Son of God was of any other substance or essence, or created, or liable to change or conversion.

§ 6. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.

Additions were made to the Nicene Creed by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, with some omissions and changes, in

opposition to various heresies.[4] The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is as follows:

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds; Light of Light; very God of very God; begotten, not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation descended from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended

into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and cometh again with glory to judge the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;[5] and we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

§ 7. "Filioque."

The recensions of this creed by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon are like the foregoing, not having the words "and from the Son" in the article on the procession of the Holy Spirit. It is said that a Council at Braga, in Spain (A.D. 412), added the words *et Verbo*, "and from the Word;" but the records of that Council are considered by many as spurious. A Council at Toledo, Spain, consisting of nineteen Bishops (A.D. 447), is said to be the first that used the *Filioque* [and from the Son]; but it did not insert it in the creed—which was first done at the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589), held by order of King Reccaredus, on his abjuring Arianism—and an anathema was there issued against all who should deny it. Charlemagne summoned a Council at Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 809), which sanctioned it; but he could not get Pope Leo III. to confirm its insertion in the creed, though the Pope believed the doctrine. Pope Nicholas I. favored it, and the Emperor Henry II., who was crowned at Rome A.D. 1014, by Pope Benedict VIII., induced that pontiff to adopt it, and "to let it be chanted at high mass." Thus Rome

sanctioned the interpolation, but, as [Edmund] Ffoulkes says, "with no decretal, encyclical, or synodical announcing her adhesion. The thing was done in a corner." The Greek Church has never admitted it. Gradually, however, it came into general use in the Western Church, where it is now, and has been for centuries, universal. When the Latin monks tried to introduce it into Jerusalem (A.D. 809), they were denounced as heretics by their Greek brethren. The interpolation caused a breach between the Eastern and Western Churches which has never been repaired.[6]

We believe in the double procession, but cannot justify the

Latins in thus adding to the creed. This symbol (with the exception noted) has been received by all orthodox communions—our own included, though we have not embodied it, like other Episcopal Churches, in our liturgy. The Greek Church from the earliest times used it as the creed of baptism, being in substance the same as the Apostles' Creed, used in the West. The Greeks called it Μάθημα, "the lesson," because the catechumens learned it by heart. Leontius Bisantius, in his work on Sects, calls it Τὸ Μάθημα τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ, the lesson, symbol, or creed of Nice.

§ 8. The Athanasian Creed.

The Athanasian Creed is a still further paraphrase on the Apostles' Creed. No one now supposes it was composed by Athanasius [296–373 A.D.]. Some attribute it to Vincentius of Lireus in the fifth century, others to Venantius Fortunatus in the sixth century; others to Hilary, Bishop of Arles, who died A.D. 449. Paschasius Quesnel and others thought that it was composed by Vigilius, Bishop of Tapsus, in Africa, at the close of the fifth century. Gieseler thinks that it originated in Spain in the seventh century. It is very subtile, metaphysical, and minute. It was not written in Greek, but in Latin, and was never adopted by any general council, though it was generally received in the seventh century as an ecumenical symbol, along with the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. The Lutherans placed all three of these creeds in the *Liber Concordiae*, and the eighth article of the Church of England

says: “The three creeds—Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed—ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” The Protestant Episcopal Church of America has, however, omitted the Athanasian Creed from the Liturgy. Many in the Anglican and Irish Episcopal Churches are trying to get it eliminated, because of its damnatory clauses, which ought by all means to be canceled. Whately and others apologize for them on the ground that they do not refer to every verse or period in the symbol, but only to “the Catholic faith,” or Christianity in general; but Bishop Burnet, with good reason, repudiates this, and falls back upon the interpretation which refers the condemnatory expressions only to those who, having the means of instruction offered to them, have rejected them—that is, willful heretics. But this is not satisfactory. The creed itself is a venerable and valuable symbol, and we do not think, with some, that its “positive and negative propositions are contradictory and puzzling to the understanding.” It is not designed for unlearned persons, but as a dialectic development of the dogmas of Christianity, as settled by the most acute and learned theologians of the age in which it was written.

We give the recension[7] of this creed as it is inserted in the Anglican Liturgy—standard edition of 1662—omitting, of course, the *Gloria Patri*, which is there appended to it:

Quicunque Vult.

1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.
2. Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
3. And the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.
4. Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.
5. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.
6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal.
7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy

Ghost.

8. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate.
9. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.
10. 36
    The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal.
11. And yet they are not three eternals, but one eternal.
12. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated, but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.
13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty.
14. And yet they are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.
15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.
16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.
17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.
18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.
19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord;
20. So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say there be three Gods, or three Lords.
21. The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten.
22. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.
23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.
24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.
25. And in this Trinity none is afore or after other; none is greater or less than another.
26. But the whole three persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal.
27. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshiped.
28. He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.
29. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he

also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

30. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;
31. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the world;
32. Perfect God, and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;
33. Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood.
34. Who although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ;
35. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God;
36. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person.
37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.
38. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead.
39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right-hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
40. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works.
41. 37
    And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.
42. This is the Catholic Faith, which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

§ 9. Doctrinal Standards of the Roman Church.

It would have been well if the Latin Church had gone no further than the *Filioque* in its addition to the creed. But Pope Pius IV., in 1564, added twelve articles comprising new and heretical points, developed during the Dark Ages, and erected into dogmas, declared essential to "the faith out of which there is no salvation."

These new dogmas were made obligatory by a bull of the

pontiff. They are also embodied in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent, which are binding on all Roman Catholics. The Church of Rome abounds in catechisms, set forth by Episcopal authority, which are all binding on "the faithful" as far as they are agreeable to the canons and decrees of the council.[8] Agreeably to the doctrine of development recognized by the Church of Rome, the late pontiff, Pius IX., added two other dogmas to the creed, that of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, proclaimed December 8, 1854, and that of the infallibility of the Pope, which, in the Vatican Council, July 18, 1870, composed of six hundred and forty-two Bishops, was approved by a vote of five hundred and thirty-four (one hundred and six being absent and two voting in the negative), and was pronounced by the Pope a dogma, "by virtue of his apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred council."

§ 10. Greek Doctrinal Standards.

The Greek Church, in addition to the Apostles' and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creeds—without the *Filioque*—set forth what is called "The Confession of the True and Genuine Faith," presented to Mohammed II. in 1453. "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Greek Church," composed by Mogilas, was approved in 1643 by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. This is the recognized standard of the Russo-Greek Church.[9]

§ 11. Confessions of the Waldenses.

The Waldenses have several confessions, all of a scriptural and Protestant complexion. They set forth what they called "The Noble Lesson," which is referred to the year 1100; a Confession in 1120; another orthodox and elaborate symbol, distinctly recognizing Protestant views, as opposed to Papists and Anabaptists, presented in 1542 to the King of France. They also set forth a symbol embracing seventeen propositions in a synod at Angrogna in 1535; and another of thirty-three articles—their present Confession drawn up by Leger and others in 1655—both of which are thoroughly

Protestant, though slightly tinged with the peculiarities of Calvinism, which they learned from the Swiss divines.

§ 12. The Lutheran Standards.

The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Church—as the Lutherans style their standards—comprise the three Creeds; the Augsburg Confession with the Apology by Melancthon; the Articles of Smalcald and the Catechism, both by Luther. Some Lutheran Churches recognize the Form of Concord. There are Saxon, Würtemberg, Suabian, Pomeranian, Mansfeldtian, and Copenhagen Confessions, which agree generally with the Symbolical Books, and are of authority in the countries after which they are named. The Evangelical Lutherans of the United States, for the most part, accord only a general approval of "The Symbolical Books," as they repudiate the high Lutheran views of the sacraments and other points.

§ 13. The Reformed Confessions.

The Reformed Confessions are numerous; they are all less or more tinged with Calvinism. The four Helvetic Confessions consist of that of Basle, 1530; the Summary and Confession of the Helvetic Churches, 1536; the Simple Exposition (ascribed to Bullinger), 1566; the Helvetic *Formula Consensus*, 1675. The Tetrapolitan Confession, 1531, is ascribed to Bucer. It derives its name from the four cities, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, whose deputies signed it. The Heidelberg Catechism, 1563, was drawn up by Ursinus and Olevianus. The

Confession of the Gallic Churches was accepted at the First Synod of the Reformed, held at Paris in 1559. The Belgic Confession was drawn up in 1559, and approved in 1561. The Confession of Faith of Scotland was allowed by the Three Estates in 1560, and signed by King James in 1561; though the Westminster Confession and Catechisms were made by act of Parliament, and still continue the doctrinal standard of the Church of Scotland and all its offshoots. Like the Confession and Catechism of the Synod of Dort—the

standard of the Dutch Reformed Church, framed in 1619—they are intensely Calvinistic. The Westminster Assembly was a Synod of one hundred and fifty divines, convened by Parliament in 1643; it adopted a Confession and two Catechisms, which, bating their Calvinism, are very valuable.

§ 14. The English Articles.

The Anglican Confession, of which ours is an abridgment, has a peculiar history.

The first attempt at a Reformed Confession in England was "The Erudition of a Christian Man," published in the reign of Henry VIII. As soon as a Service Book was prepared a catechism was placed in it, which, with a few verbal alterations, and the addition of the sacramental part in 1604—attributed to Bishop Overall—is the same still known as "The Church Catechism." Other catechisms were afterward brought into use.

In 1549 Cranmer published a series of articles which were objected to by Hooper because they taught that the sacraments confer grace. In the same year the King and Parliament projected a commission of thirty-two persons, including Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Coverdale, Scovy, Peter Martyr, Justice Hales, etc., to frame ecclesiastical laws. This commission was appointed in 1551, and Cranmer laid before this body as a basis a series of thirteen Articles, chiefly extracted from the Augsburg Confession.

November 24, 1552, "Forty-two Articles" were laid before the Royal Council, and in March, 1553, before the Convocation. They were prepared chiefly by Cranmer and Ridley on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, and the Catechism was prefixed to them soon after their publication. King Edward VI. died July 6, 1553. They were, of course, suspended during the reign of Bloody Mary, who died in 1558. On the succession of

Elizabeth, Archbishop Parker recast the Forty-two Articles, making special use in the revision of the Augsburg and Würtemberg Confessions. The revised draught was laid before the Convocation, which made some small changes and adopted the "Thirty-eight Articles" January, 1562–3. In 1566 a bill was brought into Parliament to confirm them. It passed the Commons, but by the

Queen's command was dropped in the House of Lords.

In 1571 the Convocation revised the Articles of 1562, fixed their number "Thirty-nine," and subscribed them in Latin and English. In 1628 an edition in English was published, with the Declaration of Charles I. prefixed. They were adopted by the Convocation of the Irish Church in 1635, and by the Scotch Episcopal Church at the close of the eighteenth century. They were adopted by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States in Convention September 12, 1801—except the Twenty-first, and the modification of some others.

Articles I., II, XXV., XXXI. agree in doctrine and nearly in words with the Augsburg Confession. The Ninth and Sixteenth came from the same source. Articles XIX., XX., XXV., XXXIV. resemble in matter and language certain articles drawn up by a commission appointed by Henry VIII., and annotated by him. Article XI. is ascribed to Cranmer—the better part of it was in the Articles of 1552. Article XVII., "On Predestination," has occasioned great dispute. The Calvinists claim it as on their side, affirming that it and Article IX., and some others, were framed under the suggestion of the Calvinistic reformers, with whom the Church of England was then in correspondence; and there seems to be some ground for this, though the Arminian divines of the English Church stoutly deny it. The truth seems to be that these Articles were drawn up in the spirit of compromise and comprehension; they give full satisfaction to neither party. As Arminians, we are very glad that we are not called upon to subscribe them.

§ 15. Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Churches.

When John Wesley revised and abridged the Liturgy for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, he also revised and abridged the Confession. He reduced their number to twenty-four, eliminating Articles III., VIII., XIII., XV., XVII., XVIII., XX., XXI., XXIII., XXVI., XXIX., XXXIII., XXXV., XXXVI,

and XXXVII. He also omitted portions of several of the rest, and made occasional verbal changes. The portions omitted are ambiguous or unnecessary, and there is scarcely a word which Mr. Wesley canceled which we would wish restored.

At the Christmas Conference, 1784, in which the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, the Twenty-four Articles were adopted, and another was added, numbered XXIII.—"Of the Rulers of the United States of America"—making "Twenty-five Articles," which were published in the second edition of the Liturgy in 1786. Several subsequent Conferences have made a few verbal changes in some of the Articles, not all of which are for the better, as we shall have occasion to notice.

Some of the minor Methodist bodies have attempted to improve the Confession by both omissions and additions; but their experiments are not encouraging. The Confession is, of course, susceptible of improvement; but there is great advantage in settled formulae. "Meddle not with them that are given to change."

§ 16. Objections to Creeds Answered.

The objections urged against Creeds, Confessions, and Catechisms are of little weight, *e. g.*:

1. *They supersede the Bible.* This is preposterous, as they constantly refer to the Bible, and derive all their authority from it.
2. *They engender schisms.* They do not. They merely formulate the views of different sections of Christendom, which is expedient, as no method has yet been devised to make all Christians think alike on questions of doctrine, discipline, or worship.
3. *They induce hypocrisy.* Admit that they are sometimes the occasion of it, but they are not the cause. The Bible is open to the same charge. Do Colenso, Abbott, and others of their class believe the Bible? Yet they have subscribed to it as a revelation from God. If a Reformed minister, who has subscribed the Helvetic or Westminster Confession, while he does not believe in Calvinism, is a hypocrite; if a Lutheran, who has subscribed the Symbolical Books, but does not believe in Consubstantiation, is a hypocrite; if a Puseyite who has subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles in a non-natural sense, while he is a Romanist in heart and perhaps in act, is a hypocrite—what

is he who professes and calls himself a Christian on the faith of the Bible, while he denies its divine authority? Shall we therefore reject the Bible as the patron of hypocrisy?

4. *They are unnecessary.* If they be, they are unavoidable. We once had a document slipped into our hands, the purport of which was: This is the creed of a sect which has no creed! To become a member of that sect—indeed, to become a Christian at all—I must renounce my baptism by affusion in infancy (which I hold to be valid), and be immersed for the forgiveness of my sins (which I feel assured were forgiven by my faith in Christ). The truth is every sect has its creed, and in these days of the pen and press it will not remain unformulated. The most noisy and irrepressible disputants in pulpit, on platform, by press, are those who denounce creeds, confessions, and catechisms. We say it is expedient—nay, necessary—for every sect to formulate its system of doctrine, discipline, and worship. It is unavoidable.

§ 17. The Necessity for Creeds Positively Argued.

[The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, having been given by inspiration of God, are for man in his present state the only and the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. This divine word, therefore, is the only standard of doctrine which has any intrinsic authority binding the consciences of men. All other standards are of value or authority only as they teach what the Scriptures teach. But it is the inalienable duty and necessity of men to arrive at the meaning of the Scriptures in the use of their natural faculties, and by the ordinary instruments of interpretation. Since all truth is self-consistent in all its parts, and since the human reason always instinctively strives to reduce all the elements of knowledge with which it grapples to logical unity and consistency, it follows that men must more or less formally construct a system of faith out of the materials presented in the Scriptures. Every student of the Bible necessarily does this in the very process of understanding and digesting its teaching, and all such students make it manifest that they have found, in one way or another, a system of faith as complete as for them has been possible, by the very language they use in prayer, praise, and ordinary religious discourse. If men refuse the assistance afforded by the statements of doctrine slowly elaborated and defined by the Church, they must severally make out their own creed by their own unaided wisdom. *The real question between the*

Church and the impugners of human creeds is not, as the latter often pretend, between the word of God and the creed of man, but between the tried and proved faith of the collective body of God's people and the private judgment and the unassisted wisdom of the individual objector.[10]]

§ 18. Why Creeds Use Not the Exact Words of Scripture.

[We are told by Athanasius that when the Nicene fathers commenced their

deliberations they had some intention of embodying their decision upon the doctrines of Arius in the words of Scripture; but that, upon more careful consideration, especially of the fact that Arius professed to receive all the statements of Scripture as well as they, that he put his own construction upon them, and gave an interpretation of them in accordance with his own views, they directed their attention to the object of devising certain statements which should be possessed of these two properties: *First, that they accurately embodied the substance of what Scripture teaches upon the subject; and, secondly, that they involved a denial or contradiction of Arian views so clearly and explicitly that no Arian would receive them, and which should thus be accurate tests of truth and error upon the subject.* . . . The Arians of the fourth century professed to dislike the Nicene Creed for this among other reasons. . . . The objection is a very frivolous one; and when it does not proceed, as it too often does, from a dislike to the doctrines which the creeds and confessions objected to inculcate, is founded upon very obvious misapprehensions. So long as men, all professing to take the Scripture as their rule, deduce from it opposite doctrines, or put inconsistent interpretations upon its statements, it will be indispensably necessary, if they are to attempt to ascertain how far they agree with, and how far they differ from, each other, that they employ, in expressing their convictions, words different from those which are used in Scripture.[11]]

§ 19. Abuses To Be Avoided.

The great point is to avoid the abuses of such symbols, *e. g.*:

1. *Ranking them with the Bible.* The Bible is the only rule and the sufficient rule of our faith and practice. So we declare in our Confession. It may be asked who does not hold this? Well, if none differ, then none are open to censure. But what of the additions which Rome has made?

2. *Too rigid interpretation.* We allow men to be sincere believers in the Bible who interpret it differently from ourselves. It seems right to allow of a similar freedom in the interpretation of the symbols. Here, if anywhere, the old rule should obtain: "In things essential, unity; in things non-essential, liberty; in all things, charity."
3. *Too lax interpretation.* We can but explain our meaning by illustrations:

    - No one is justified in so interpreting the Romish symbols as to allow him to subscribe to them, he being a Protestant;
    - No one is justified in so interpreting a Protestant Confession as to allow him to subscribe to it, he being a Romanist;
    - No one is justified in so interpreting a Reformed Confession as to allow him to subscribe to it, he being a synergist, for though synergism is necessarily contained in every Confession,

      yet the Reformed Confessions generally inculcate monergism;12 and no one should try to be on the fence and on both sides of it;
    - No one is justified in so interpreting our Confession and Catechism as to allow him to subscribe to them, he being an Antitrinitarian, Pelagian, Romanizer, Anabaptist, or fanatic of any kind, against whom the Articles of Religion are leveled;
    - No one is justified in so interpreting the symbols of his Church as to allow him to subscribe to them, and not to cancel the subscription, while he cares nothing for them, scarcely ever consults them, and perhaps varies from them not only in minute matters, but also in some of their distinctive features.

9. *Persecution of dissenters.* But who persecutes another for not subscribing his creed? Well, if none do so, then none thus abuse the symbol, or fall under censure. It is true (thank God!) "uniformity" is not now enforced by legal pains and penalties; there is no inquisition, with its racks and stakes,

faggots and fires; there are no star-chambers or test-acts, no contra-Remonstrant or Puritan proscriptions, enforced by law, impinging on the property, liberty, and lives of dissenters as in the times of our fathers. But there are still petty persecutions enough, in the form of sneers, social proscriptions, misrepresentations, and the like. *We,* whose Confession and Catechism, as to orthodoxy, may challenge comparison with the symbols of the First Four General Councils (which indeed we indorse), have been, in our hearing, ranked with Socinians, Pelagians, and Papists, because, forsooth, we cannot subscribe to symbols which both affirm and deny the synergism of the Scriptures and the monergism of Augustin.

But enough. We thank God that we have a good confession, which by his help we will study, expound, and so use as not to abuse it; testing every thing by the touch-stone of the inspired word, which is the ultimate rule in faith as well as practice.

---

1. In the immediately preceding verse the same term is translated "profession," and the corresponding verb "profess." The Revised Version gives a consistent rendering throughout: "Fight the good fight of the faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst *confess* the good *confession* in the sight of many witnesses. I charge thee in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good *confession*," etc.—T.↩
2. Dr. Summers belonged to the extreme conservative school of text criticism. This verse is wholly omitted from the Revised Version of 1881, which follows such eminent critics as Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort. The three great uncial MSS., *Sinaiticus*, *Vaticanus*, and *Alexandrinus*, are all destitute of this passage.—T.↩
3. For other germs of creed in the Scriptures compare the confessions of Nathanael (John i. 49), Peter (Matt. xvi. 16), and Thomas (John xx. 28). In this connection the following passages may also be considered: 1 Cor. viii. G; 1 Tim. iii. 16; and Heb. vi. 1, 2.—T.↩
4. Particularly the heresy of Macedonius and his followers, who denied the essential Deity of the Holy Ghost. They were joined by those Arians and Semi-Arians who were styled Pneumatomachians—

fighters against the Spirit.—T.↩

5. This clause was probably directed against the Novatians, who rebaptized, whereas the orthodox recognized heretical baptism.—T.↩
6. The preceding statement has been somewhat expanded from an article of Dr. Summers's on "The Three Creeds," in the *Southern Methodist Review* for April, 1880. From the same source I add the following note: "The Greek Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, in 1718, repudiated emphatically the *Filioque*, and said, We believe that there is a twofold procession of the Holy Spirit—the one natural, eternal, and before time, according to which the Holy Spirit *proceeds* from the Father alone; and of which it is both written in the creed and the Lord has said, 'The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the spirit of truth, WHICH PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER.' (John xv. 26.) The other procession is *temporal*, and *deputative*, according to which the Holy Spirit is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds, and flows from both the Father and the Son for the sanctification of the creature. As to his temporal and outward procession, we agree that he proceeds, comes, or is sent, by the Son, or *through the Son's mediation*, and *from the Son*, in this sense of an *outward* procession, for the sanctification of the creature. But this πρόεσις, or mission, we do not call procession, lest we should be as unhappy as the papists, who, because of the limited dialect of the Latin language, which is unable to express the πρόεσις, or mission, by one word, and ἐκπόρευσις, or procession, by another, have called them both processions, which afterward grew into error, and made them take the *eternal* procession for that πρόεσις which was *in time*."—T.↩
7. This creed I have inserted from the before-mentioned article of Dr. Summers.—T.↩
8. The authoritative "Roman Catechism," based on the Canons of the Council of Trent, was prepared by command of Pius IV., and promulgated by Pius V., 1566.—T.↩
9. In addition to these, mention should be made of the "Confession of Dositheus," or the eighteen decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672, and "The Longer Catechism" of the Russian Church, prepared by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow (1820–1867), and revised and approved by the Most Holy Synod in 1839. For the full text of these documents, as well as of the confession of 1643, see Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. II., pp. 275–542.—T.↩
10. The foregoing thoughtful and carefully expressed Statement I have inserted from Dr. A. A. Hodge's "Outlines of Theology," pp. 112, 113.—T.↩
11. This passage is extracted from Principal Cunningham's "Historical

Theology," Vol. I., pp. 286, 287.—T.↩

12. Monergism (Greek, μόνος, sole, and, ἔργειν, to work,) designates the doctrine that in the inward process of human salvation there is but one efficient agent, the Holy Spirit, and is used above to designate the Calvinistic or Augustinian doctrine of regeneration. Synergism (Greek, σύν, with, and ἔργειν, to work), designates the doctrine that man co-operates with the Spirit in the accomplishment of individual salvation. It was originally applied to the doctrine of Melancthon, as set forth in the third edition of his *Loci Communes*. Without necessarily indorsing every element of Melancthon's view, Dr. Summers employs the term to designate the Arminian doctrine of personal salvation.—T.↩

Book I. Theology Proper, or the Doctrine of God.

Article I.
Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

47

There is hut one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Introduction.

In revising the Anglican Confession for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, John Wesley made no change in Article I., except to substitute "are" for "be" in the second part. But in 1786 the Bishops or the Conference omitted the word "passions" [in the privative description of God as "without body, parts, or passions"]. In some Confessions—*e. g.*, the Helvetic—the first Article treats of the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith. But the English Reformers began with the great theological Articles, the belief of which has always been considered the test of catholicity and orthodoxy. They wished to put in the foreground the proof that the Reformed Church of England was catholic and orthodox.

The compilers of the Articles were not happy in prefixing titles to them. The title prefixed to this Article notes specifically the subject of the second part. It would have been better to say simply, "Of God." The Article consists of two parts:

I. Of the Being, Perfections, and Works of God;
II. Of the Trinity.

Part I. Of the Being, Perfections, and Works of God.

Chapter I. The Being of God.

§ 1. Preliminary.

48

As the belief in the divine existence is presupposed in the Bible, so it is assumed in this article [which does not assert "God is," but, as against polytheism, "There is *but* one living and true God"].

The Confession is not a system of natural, but of revealed, theology, and the authority of the Scriptures is assumed.

On this account some theologians contend that proofs of the divine existence are out of place in Christian theology. Dr. Knapp admits that the full and scientific statement of these proofs belongs rather to metaphysics and natural theology than here. Nevertheless, he gives an epitome of them, and it may not be amiss for us to do the same.

§ 2. Is the Knowledge of God Innate?

It is thought by some that the knowledge of God is innate to man. By the innate knowledge of God, we suppose, is meant an idea, or notion, of the Supreme Being, impressed on the mind from the beginning of any one's existence. Now, we know nothing of innate ideas of any kind. We are not conscious of any thing in our intellect that was not first in our senses, or that did not originate in our reflection on their discoveries, except, as Leibnitz would add, the intellect itself—*Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu; nisi intellectus ipse.* Admitting that the intellect, apart from the senses, may intuit certain primordial beliefs, or axioms, yet it cannot be shown that they will lead to the knowledge of God without some influence *ab extra*. Kant held that the phenomena of the external world are subject to the conception [or universal form] of space, and the phenomena of the mind to that of time; and as space and time are not obtained

49

from sensation, this is considered a refutation of sensationalism. But

then he contends that dogmatic idealism is also refuted: as the matter of knowledge is supplied by external impressions, the mind cannot think except so far as it has been excited by an objective stimulus.

The theistic argument recognizes what is true in sensationalism, and also in transcendentalism. Locke may have pushed the former to unwarrantable consequences, and Kant the latter. Indeed, the tenet, there is nothing in the intellect that was not first in the senses, was not exactly what Locke held; nor was it borrowed from him by the theologians. Long before Locke, Pearson wrote ("On the Creed," Art. I):

> Although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connatural to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a God, yet I rather conceive the soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it, from the beginning; but being we can have no assurance of its pre-existence, we may more rationally judge it to receive the first impressions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If, then, the soul of man be at the first like a fair, smooth table, without any actual characters or knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection, then must we not refer the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion—at least, we are assured God never charged us with the knowledge of him upon that account.[1]

An infant does not appear to have an idea of any thing except a vague knowledge of what it cannot help perceiving by its senses. Who has ever proved that the idea of God is impressed on the infantile mind? Who has ever proved that an untutored adult has any idea of God? or, if he has, that it did not originate in reflection and reasoning on the phenomena of nature?

Dr. Nevin, indeed, says: "The whole possibility of religion for us starts in the God-consciousness, or direct sense of Deity, which is as much a part of our original nature as the sense we have of the world around us or of our own existence. It is not put into us by any outward evidence or argument. It authenticates and necessitates itself as a fundamental fact in our life; and in doing this it certifies, to the same extent, the truth of the object on which it is exercised. Or, rather, we must say, the truth of the object on which it is exercised, which is the Divine Being, or the existence

of the Absolute, certifies itself, makes itself sure in and through the consciousness into which it enters. In this sense the idea of God comes before Christianity, as it comes before religion in every other form." This is undeveloped, ambiguous, and unsupported by argument and experience. The capacity to acquire the knowledge of God—in which man differs from the brute—is confounded with the knowledge itself. This knowledge, of course, antedates Christianity —if by Christianity is meant the gospel-system as introduced by Jesus Christ and his apostles—because the knowledge of God has been in the world from the time of its creation.

Professors Tait and Stewart say: "We assume, as absolutely self-evident, the existence of a Deity who is the creator of all things." ("Unseen Universe," Chap. II.) That is more easily assumed than proved. If the existence of a Deity were self-evident, none would need any proof of his existence, any instruction concerning his existence, and there could be no atheists to deny his existence. What they might assume, and what can readily be proved, and what is matter of consciousness and experience, is that we are "creatures capable of God"—that we are endowed with faculties which, being duly developed under proper guidance, will apprehend, though they cannot comprehend, the Infinite and Absolute Being whom we call God.

Dr. McCosh puts the matter thus: "I do not stand up for a God-consciousness as a simple and single instinct of gazing directly on God. I maintain that there are a number and variety oi native principles, each of which, being favored by external circumstances, would lead us up to God." That we understand. At least we understand by it that the idea of God is not innate, not immediate, not miraculously impressed upon the mind, but that the mind is so constituted that in the exercise of its native powders, under favoring auspices—including the operation of the Holy Spirit, as well as external instruction—it can arrive at the knowledge of God.

Watson ("Inst.," Part II., Chap. I., p. 156) says: "If indeed the idea of God were innate, as some have contended, the question would be set at rest. But then every human being would be in possession of it. Of this there is not only no proof at all, but the evidence of fact is against it; and the doctrine of innate ideas may, with confidence, be pronounced a mere theory, assumed to

support favorite notions, but contradicted by all experience. We are

all conscious that we gain the knowledge of God by *instruction*; and we observe that in proportion to the want of instruction men are ignorant, as of other things, so of God."

Pearson well says: "It is a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth that he must believe it because it is evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore only doubts of it because it is not evident unto him." ("On the Creed," Art. 1.)

§ 3. Is the Knowledge of God Intuitive?

Did any one ever acquire the knowledge of God by an immediate act of the mind, without the intervention of sensation, reflection, argument, and testimony? All men have the capacity of acquiring this knowledge, but is it intuitive?

Dr. Nevin, himself, asks: "But who will say that this general idea of God can be for us, therefore, the actual root of Christianity, so that any among us, starting with that alone, could ever by means of it come to a full construction of what God is for true Christian faith? It lies at the ground of pantheism, dualism, polytheism, deism, and all false religions, no less than at the ground of Christianity."

Truly it does; but this statement itself is extremely vague. "This general idea of God," of which he speaks, is not innate or intuitive —it is not "the God-consciousness, or direct sense of Deity." It is rather a corruption of the idea of God distorted by tradition and false inferences from natural phenomena in the case of those who have no written revelation or competent teachers, or, having them, repudiate their instruction, as did those of whom the apostle writes, who, "when they knew God, glorified him not as God—professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." (Rom. i. 21–23.)

What sort of intuitive knowledge of God, or God-consciousness, have these men who recognize nothing but *force*, or cosmic energy, or stream of tendency, in all the universe?

It is well said that the orthodox Christian doctrine has asserted from the beginning, that a real, objective knowledge of God comes only from revelation, and that only κατὰ τὸ ἐφικτόν, as Aristotle

says, according to the best capacity of man.

52

It does not help the matter much to say that there may be an intuitive knowledge of the *being*, but not of the *character*, of God. Dr. Walker says in a supplementary chapter to his "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation:"

> We are aware that there are those who believe and teach that the *character* of God, as well as the *being* of a God, is revealed subjectively in men: we will notice the superficial and injurious character of this philosophy in another place; but here we affirm that all history and the common experience and reason of men prove the fallacy of such an opinion. A sense, or intuition, or conception (call it what you will) of the existence of a God, is found in all ages, existing in all races of men. It is a universal conviction, and belongs to man as man. But no two men have precisely the same idea of God's *character*. The diversity in one case is as perfect as the unity of the other. Without a revelation men believe that there is a God; but their views of the divine character are as diverse as their languages, and have never risen above the level of heroism, naturalism, and lust, in connection with the natural attributes of wisdom and power. The idea of the existence of God is the idea of being. The idea of character implies quality; to suppose that man has intuitive ideas of either the physical or spiritual qualities of things is absurd. Again, every man is conscious that he has not himself got an intuitive idea of the character of God. Every man believes that God is; but what he is, is with every man matter of reflection, or of faith. The conscious experience of every man is testimony in this case. It is a fact admitted, almost universally, that the present state of the creation, both moral and physical, is imperfect. Allowing, then (if it be desired), that man has an intuitive idea that a Divine Being, or Beings, exist—how could he get the conception of a perfect character from an imperfect world? If man forms a conception of God's character without revelation, in the present state of things, he must necessarily form a wrong one. Man is imperfect, and nature is imperfect, and therefore there is no archetype from which a true sign of the divine character can be drawn. Hence the histories of man's theologies, in all ages, are histories of errors.

But is every man conscious of possessing, intuitively, a knowledge of the simple *being* of God? The consciousness of most men will probably depose that even this idea was acquired by instruction and reflection, along with some notion however vague, grotesque, distorted, of the *character* of God. See, too, how confused is this statement: "Man has an intuitive idea that a Divine Being, or Beings, exists." *Intuitive!* And yet theistic, dualistic, polytheistic, or

pantheistic, according as he chances to be born in Christendom, or Persia, or China, or India! Nay, if the idea of God be innate, intuitive, or "revealed subjectively in men," it is absolutely certain and infallible. The great Author of our nature has never revealed subjectively to any one a pantheistic deity, or a duality or plurality of gods! Such conceptions are not innate, nor intuitive, nor God-given—they are

simply distorted notions originating in the feebleness and depravity of our fallen nature, and the "vain imaginations" superinduced by foolish traditions and erroneous instructions. The knowledge of the being, as well as of the perfections, of God, is derived from divine revelation—the fragments of which are scattered all over the world—and is developed by the careful study of nature, and subjectively by the operation of the Holy Spirit, who reveals him to our faith, "that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." (1 Cor. ii. 12.)

Faith lends its realizing light,
The clouds disperse, the shadows fly;
Th' Invisible appears in sight,
And God is seen by mortal eye.

§ 4. The A Priori Method.

Some say the knowledge of God may be acquired by *a priori* reasoning. The philosophical method of arguing from a cause to its effects, and the mathematical method of arguing from axioms, or first principles, to corollaries or demonstrative consequences, seem to be irrelevant to a question of this sort. A highly cultivated mind may conduct such a process of reasoning, but it does not appear to be of much practical value.

With the knowledge which we have of God, we may indeed argue *a priori* that there ought to be a God—analogy favors the assumption. This alone meets the demands of nature and the yearnings of humanity, but this does not furnish original proof of the proposition. Indeed, it has been thought that such reasoning leads i:) doubt rather than belief—as Pope expresses it in the Dunciad, Book IV., line 471:

We nobly take the high *priori* road,
And reason downward till we doubt of God.[2]

The ontological argument is thus stated by Anselm: "We have an idea of an infinitely perfect being; but real existence is a necessary element of infinite perfection, therefore an infinitely

54

perfect being exists." Descartes adds that this idea could not have originated in a finite source—it therefore must have been communicated to us by an infinitely perfect Being. This idea he maintains is clear and necessary.[3] Dr. Sara. Clarke holds

55

that time and space are infinite and necessary, but they are not substances, therefore there must be an infinite and eternal substance of which they are properties. Cousin holds that the idea of the finite involves the idea of the infinite, just as the idea of the "me" implies that of the "not me."

It is, indeed, argued that revelation cannot be efficient unless there is "an antecedent concept of the being revealed." It may be admitted that there must be certain primordial intuitions, or

56

we should not be capable of recognizing a Deity however revealed. But there may be the intuition of *real being*—every quality implies the substance to which it belongs, and every attribute implies real being; the intuition of *causality*—every effect implies an adequate cause; the intuition of *intelligence*—adaptation of means to ends implies intelligence; the intuition of *ethicality*—certain acts are right and others wrong; the intuition of *goodness*—inwrought in the contrivances and plans of creation: nevertheless these primordial intuitions do not of themselves give us the knowledge of God.

Dr. Winchell says: "These four primordial intuitions—the intuition of causality, the intuition of intelligence, the intuition of ethicality, and the intuition of goodness—supply our minds with the necessary concepts of infinite power, infinite intelligence, infinite justice, and infinite goodness; while the intuition of real being affirms that these are necessarily the attributes of a real being—and the being endowed with these attributes is God."

Very true. But though these axioms or beliefs may be considered intuitive and primordial, and of universal acceptance, yet it is a matter of fact that in millions of cases they do not furnish

the idea of a Supreme Being—the knowledge of God. Admit that there can be no aetiological, teleological, homological, ethical, or agathological argument without them, yet they may slumber forever in the mind, and never lead to the knowledge of God, unless they are had in requisition by the study of the word or works of God. There can be no mathematics without certain axioms or self-evident propositions; but these are not mathematics: so the primordial intuitions in question are not of themselves intuitions of the existence and perfections of God. The revelations made to us in the Bible and in nature are available to this result as they presuppose and recognize these axioms or primordial beliefs, in like manner as they presuppose and recognize and call into action the physical, intellectual, and moral powers by which we acquire a knowledge of God. They may be universal and infallible, like the instincts of the lower animals; but, as in the latter case, may never be called into exercise for any religious intent. They do not, as some express it, *intuit* the existence of the infinite and absolute Being that we call God.

§ 5. The A Posteriori Method.

57

As the *a priori* method is not satisfactory, the *a posteriori* method is had in requisition. This method comprehends the (1) *cosmological*, (2) *teleological*, and (3) *moral* arguments for the existence of God.

(1) The *Cosmological* argument is thus stated: Every new thing and every change in a previously existing thing, must have a cause sufficient and pre-existing; the universe consists of a system of changes; therefore the universe must have a cause exterior and anterior to itself. Hume's objection that our causal judgment rests solely on experience, which gives only sequence and not efficiency, is met by the fact that our causal judgment is a self-evident truth, bearing marks of universality and necessity. Its denial is absurd. The mind necessarily postulates a cause for every thing that exists, and rests only when it has reached a great First Cause. That which cannot be denied without absurdity may well be received as a necessary truth. Hence the belief in a great First Cause.

(2) The *Telological* argument—the argument from design or, as they are improperly called, final causes—is perfectly satisfactory,

except to a few cavilers. The adaptation of means to ends connotes intelligence and volition. These argue a Personal Being. Thus nearly all philosophers have argued from Socrates to our time.

Francis Bacon says: "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend and the Talmud and the Alcoran than that this universal frame is without a mind." Hume's objection is the veriest sophistry —that the judgment of final causes rests on experience, and, as we have no experience of world-making, we have no right to infer a world-maker. But we cannot avoid it: it is intuitive, universal, necessary. Nor can we displace the law of design by that of the survival of the fittest. How did the first germs originate? How did special organs come into existence? How can we account for the superinduction of sensation, of intelligence, of volition, of the sense of moral obligation, necessary ideas, and the like? Natural Selection is as unmeaning a term as Cudworth's "Plastic Nature." There is nothing in the universe, in inanimate, irrational, or rational beings, that does not display marks of design, and so the existence of a great Designer. This may not prove his infinity; but it

seems impossible to deny that one who designs all that we see in the universe must possess infinite properties, such as we attribute to God.[4]

(3) The *Moral* argument is of great force. It is derived from the constitution of man and his relations to the universe. Man is conscious that he is himself an intelligent and spontaneous cause. This leads him to infer an absolute cause, such as the Personal Being connoted by cosmology and teleology. We refer our own actions to mind, so we cannot but refer all the phenomena of the universe to mind. The law of conscience—the categorical imperative—implies a sovereign will which binds our will. Our intellectual and moral judgments are not transformed sensations, as the associationalists argue. They are necessary, universal, and dominant. Even savages know that they are moral beings, and are under the law of a superior Power. They have the religious element, and an instinct to seek and to retain the favor of that Power, however absurd may be their views in general.

§ 6. Does Nature Alone Afford the Knowledge of God?

But can the knowledge of God be acquired simply by the works of nature? To settle this question we must find men who can prove to us that they never received any traditional or historical information in the premises, and yet possess the knowledge of God, which they themselves attribute to the study of the works of nature.

Among partially enlightened nations, where there is some knowledge of God, there will be found either written documents or unwritten traditions, which embody some fragments, however distorted, of primitive revelations. Where there are no fragments of this sort, there is no idea of a supernatural power. The

question, indeed, is one of great obscurity. It is exceedingly difficult to determine whether there is any slight vestige of this knowledge among certain deeply debased tribes; but this very fact proves that the phenomena of nature are not sufficient of themselves to lead men to the knowledge of God.

It is frequently said that the Scriptures refer to the works of creation in proof of the existence of God; but it is rather in proof of the unity and perfections of God, in opposition to idolatry and false conceptions of the divine character, than in opposition to atheism or pantheism.

This is the force of those great classical passages (Ps. xix. 1–6; Rom. i. 19–25): “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world; in them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.” “Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man,

and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanliness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen."

There is indeed a passage in the Wisdom of Solomon (c. xiii.) which has been thought to affirm the competency of men to acquire the knowledge of God from a consideration of the works of nature. But, aside from the fact of the non-canonicity of this

book, a careful analysis will show that the author was arguing against polytheism, not against atheism. He says: "Surely vain are all men by nature, who are ignorant of God, and could not out of the good things that are seen, know him that is; neither by considering the works did they acknowledge the work-master; but deemed either fire, or wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the violent water, or the lights of heaven, to be the gods which govern the world. With whose beauty, if they being delighted, took them to be gods, let them know how much better the Lord of them is; for the first author of beauty hath created them. But if they were astonished at their power and virtue, let them understand by them how much mightier he is that made them. For by the greatness and beauty of the creatures proportionately the Maker of them is seen. But yet for this they are the less to be blamed; for they peradventure err seeking God, and desirous to find him. For, being conversant in his works, they search him diligently, and believe their sight; because the things are beautiful that are seen. Howbeit neither are they to be pardoned. For if they were able to know so much, that they could aim at the world, how did they not sooner find out the Lord thereof? But miserable are they, and in dead things is their hope, who called them gods which are the works of men's hands."

It might be asked how they can be held censurable who desired to find God, yet failed in their effort? But it is asserted that they did thus fail, and this proves that the works of nature alone are not sufficient to teach the knowledge of God.

If, indeed, through moral pravity—not liking to retain God in their knowledge—when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, but willfully went over to polytheism and idolatry (as was the case of the heathen censured by Paul in Romans i.) then they are

"without excuse"—"they are not to be pardoned."

But imagine a race born and brought up without any traditional information concerning a Supernatural Being, and without art, science, or literature. Can it be supposed that such savages by *a posteriori* reasoning—by a contemplation of the works of God—would ever rise to a conception of his existence? No more than by "the high *priori* road," or by intuition, or by innate ideas. The *anthrop* knows no more by nature than the *anthropoid*. There is this difference, however—and it is all but

infinite—the *anthropoid* can by no means, no process, no argument, no tuition, no tradition, no revelation, acquire the knowledge of God; the *anthrop* can. He has that knowledge. He is not only a "creature capable of God"—having the capacity to acquire the knowledge of his Maker—but he does know him.

Admit that among some extremely debased tribes the vestige of the Creator may be well-nigh erased from the mind—say, if you please, wholly erased—yet among all who are not so divested of the prerogatives of our humanity as to be sunk well-nigh to the level of the beasts that perish, there are some traces of primitive revelations, as among the aborigines of America; while others more highly favored have the Scriptures of truth, by the light of which we can look through nature up to nature's God.

§ 7. Conclusion from the Foregoing.

The knowledge of God, therefore, was originally communicated to man by his Creator, who held personal intercourse with him. These manifestations were reported by the human family, and perpetuated from age to age in all parts of the world.

But as unwritten traditions are liable to distortion and ultimate extinction, God saw proper to embody them in written revelations, duly authenticated and providentially perpetuated through every age.

The fullest manifestation has been made in the incarnation of his Son, which stupendous fact, with all its concomitant and consequent wonders, has been duly attested by competent witnesses —"God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to

his own will."

Of the certainty of this revelation we may have the most satisfactory proof, as the same Divine Agent is sent into the world for its attestation. Thus "if any one is disposed to do the will of God he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God;" and "he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself."

§ 8. Corroborative Testimony of Nature.

The enlightened study of nature corroborates all the teachings of the Scripture concerning the being and perfections of God, in opposition to all atheistic or antitheistic notions.

Atheism tries to account for the existence of the universe by

the most ungrounded assumptions—as that it came into existence by chance, or that eternal monads came fortuitously together and formed the *cosmos*; or, which is a new version of the same Democritian nonsense, that every thing which exists was evolved from certain primordial cells; or that there has been, and will be, an endless chain of causes and effects.

These notions are utterly unworthy of attention, as they are all baseless hypotheses. If they were as reasonable as they are preposterous, they would be entitled to no regard, as they have no ground of proof on which to rest.

The common sense of men maintains that chance is nothing—and out of nothing, nothing comes. All experience contradicts the assumptions of atheism. For every entity, fact, or occurrence there must be an adequate cause; and what cause short of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness could bring this universe into existence?

An endless chain of causes and effects is an absurdity. What are causes? Material causes are the subjects on which an agent performs his operations; formal causes denote the changes which are effected by him; physical causes are the means through which he produces effects. But over and above all these there must be efficient causes: this we know by our own experience, as we are constantly putting forth energies for the production of effects, and without which they could not be produced.

So in nature we see effects which must result from an efficient

agent; and it is not difficult to argue that the agency by which the worlds are upheld alone could bring them into existence—and he that made all things is God.

There are also final causes—these are the motives or ends for which an agent operates. We have constant experience of these as they enter into all the transactions of life.[5] It would seem

impossible not to recognize the presence of final causes or design in nature. But where there is design there must be a designer, and the designer must be viewed apart from the object and prior to it; for it is what it is because of his designing mind or purpose.

Now look into the *cosmos*—the word itself suggests the thing. See the order and beauty and grandeur and variety and fitness of all its parts, the regularity of its motions, and the harmony of its arrangements. Is all this the result of chance?

§ 9. The "Watch" Illustration of Teleology.

Bishop Pearson, John Howe, Abraham Tucker, Dr. Paley, and others illustrate this teleological argument by reference to a watch. If this intricate work of art were casually found, would the finder, who never saw a similar object before, conclude that it came into existence by chance? The wheels and springs and hands and face and case and key and exquisite finish—all the work of chance! And if the watch could multiply and perpetuate time-pieces like itself, this too would be nothing but chance! There never was such a vicious reasoner as this. The ignorant savage might imagine it a thing of life, because of its motion and sound, but he would not be so besotted as to suppose no designing mind contrived it, or skillful hand brought it into existence. He never had seen a watch-maker construct a watch, but he had seen men make other things which evinced contrivance and skillful handiwork, and he could not avoid the conclusion that the watch he had found was the product of "a cunning workman," and not of blind chance. It does, indeed, seem impossible that even the lowest and least enlightened intellect should fail to see that the objects of nature are so many letters to spell out the name of the Creator; but how any one who has received, from whatever source, or by whatever method, any information concerning God can fail to identify him as the Author

of the universe, the Maker of all things, is a most insoluble mystery. The Psalmist says—and it is a suggestive fact, that the *dixit insipiens* is repeated

in the Psalter—"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

§ 10. Answer to the Westminster Review.

The *Westminster Review* for July, 1875, in a most pronounced atheistic essay, attributes the teleological illustration of the watch to Paley as its author—a blunder which shows that the writer is not very familiar with theological literature, though he dogmatizes about it without stint, and denounces the illustration as worthless and irrelevant. One rarely sees a mountain labor with so much pain to bring forth a ridiculous mouse.

There may, forsooth, be adaptations where there is no design. There are such in nature, but they are all the result of evolution, natural selection, and survival of the fittest! What is this but unmeaning jargon? How can any thing evolve itself from nothing? How can one thing be evolved from another without an evolving agent? How can monads, for example, naturally select certain particular forms rather than others, without a directing intelligence? What determines which is the fittest? How could the vast machinery of nature, involving millions of nicely adjusted relations, and producing an infinite number of orderly results, subserving manifold well-defined purposes, be constructed without a constructive intellect? Teleology meets us at every step; not only curious adaptation, but obvious design, is observable in every thing in nature.

Say, if you please, at this stage of the argument, that it is marked by ignorance, weakness, and malevolence, as well as by wisdom, power, and love. There are the tokens of design, as in the case of the watch, and infinitely more varied and impressive. Whether or not we can vindicate the divine perfections, as displayed in the creation and government of the universe, will be seen in the sequel. A rational theodicy can settle that question in a manner which will subserve all modest, reasonable, practical ends, though, in the nature of the case, it may not meet all the imperious, captious demands of a prurient, presumptuous philosophy.

§ 11. Dr. Chalmers's View.

Dr. Chalmers says:

We hold that without a Revealed Theology we should not have known of the creation of matter out of nothing, but that by dint of a Natural Theology alone we might have inferred a God from the useful disposition of its parts. We would

65

dissever the argument on the phenomenon of the mere existence of matter from the argument founded on the phenomenon of the relations between its parts. The one impresses the understanding just as differently from the other as a stone of random form lying upon the ground impresses the observer differently from a watch. The mere existence of matter in itself indicates nothing. They are its forms and its combinations and its organic structures which alone speak to us of a Divinity—just as it is not the clay, but the shape into which it has been molded, that announces the impress of a designer's hand.

Now it matters little whether or not we can prove the absurdity of the notion that matter is eternal by any metaphysical process of reasoning—though many wise and learned men think that has been done. Inspiration assures us, and "through faith we understand, that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. xi. 3), the matter as well as the form being of divine origination. But is there any matter without form? The material universe, so far as known to us, is constituted of some sixty-five elements. These are all marked by striking individuality. Each has its own distinctive properties. They repel each other or combine together according to never-varying laws. The laboratory and the microscope and the telescope and the spectroscope develop law and order in every object that comes within the ken of man. Thus the philosopher agrees with the poet:

High-throned on heaven's eternal hill,
In number, weight, and measure still,
Thou sweetly orderest all that is.

There is only this difference between the "stone of random form" and the human body, so "fearfully and wonderfully made:" the latter forces attention to its exquisite workmanship, while the former is liable to be overlooked, though, when subjected to

chemical action in the laboratory, it is seen that “this also Cometh forth from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.”

There is not an atom in the universe that does not discover the Creator’s hand to the eye that is open to see it, as the shield of Pallas was so constructed by Phidias as to preserve the memory of the artificer as long as that wonderful work of art remained in existence.

§ 12. The Argument from Man.

Among the a posteriori proofs of the being of God man himself

is assigned a conspicuous place. As the Russian poet, Derzhavin, sublimely sings in his Ode to the Almighty:

> The effluence of thy light divine,
> Pervading worlds, hath reached my bosom too;
> Yes, in my spirit doth thy Spirit shine
> As shines the sunbeam in a drop of dew.
> Naught! but I live, and on hope’s pinions fly,
> Eager, toward thy presence; for in thee
> I live, and breathe, and dwell, aspiring high,
> Even to the throne of thy divinity—
> I am, O God! and surely thou must be!

That is sublime poetry, but it is sound philosophy as well.

It is argued that if man was made in the image of God, the characters impressed upon him must bespeak his divine origin. This principle is so widely diffused that the prevalent form given to idol-gods by their worshipers is the human, and so of their intellectual and moral attributes. Anthropomorphism has obtained in all ages and among all peoples, from the most debased polytheists to patriarchal Hebrew and Christian monotheists. These latter restrict the resemblance to the spiritual nature. The image of God in man, according to the Scriptures, consists in spirituality, intellect, moral rectitude, immortality, and sovereignty over the inferior creation—or, to use the terms of modern philosophy, intellect, sensibility, and will. As it is impossible for these to exist in the abstract, the mind naturally and necessarily refers them to a subject in which they

inhere. They inhere in man, as every one is conscious, and also in God, as, it is said, every man infers. The argument of the Psalmist is adduced in this case: “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?” (Ps. xciv. 9, 10).

But this passage is hardly in point. Those with whom the Psalmist is arguing acknowledge the existence of God, and that he is the Creator of men; and he is arguing from his work of creation to his work of providence in the moral government of men. Those with whom he is remonstrating are the persecutors of God’s people: “They slay the widow and the stranger, and murder the fatherless. Yet they say, The Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it.” Then comes the argument,

pointed and potent: “Understand, ye brutish among the people; and ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear?” It is insane to suppose that the all-wise and all-powerful Governor of the world lacks the capacity or the disposition to take cognizance of your evil conduct or to punish you for it.

The language indeed does imply that the intellectual and moral attributes of our nature are like those of the divine nature, only in us they are finite and liable to deterioration, while in God they are infinite, absolutely and eternally perfect.

Augustin notes the analogy between the mind of God and the mind of man; and, following him, Anselm says: “We cannot know the Supreme Being in himself, but only after a certain analogy with created beings, therefore most of all with the rational spirit. The more this spirit enters into itself, and observes itself, the more will it succeed in raising itself to the knowledge of the Absolute Spirit. The human spirit is a mirror in which we may see the image of that which we do not directly behold.” Dr. Chalmers says: “When we try to assign an origin for mind and its various phenomena, we cannot but refer, as if by the tact of an immediate sympathy, to an anterior mind which gave birth to this product of its own likeness and stamped its own qualities thereupon. It might seem to be an intuition, though in reality it be an inference; and we are all the more helped to it by our sense of the utter discrepancy between mind and matter, and our experience of the wide interval which separates all the combinations and forces of the one, whether in

their results or tendencies, from all the feelings and faculties which belong to the other."

He ranks this as an *argumentum a posteriori*, "an inference," though he does not call it "an inferential process," as it is "an instant conclusion of the mind." He develops it under these four points:

1. "The supremacy of conscience, the greatest and most influential argument for the being of a God. 1 John iii. 20; John viii. 9; Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16."
2. "The pleasure attendant on good affections or deeds and the pain attendant on bad ones form an evidence for a God who loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. Psalm xix. 11; Proverbs xi. 30; Isaiah lvii. 20."
3. 68
   "As the beneficial instincts of the inferior animals prove the wisdom and beneficence of a God, the intelligence wherewith man is gifted enhances the proof. Job xxxv. 11; xxxii. 8."
4. "The instincts and affections of men work out beneficial results with the production of which neither the reason nor the moral principle of men could have been interested. Psalm lxxvi. 10; Isaiah x. 7."

These phenomena do postulate the being of God; they are unaccountable on any other hypothesis; they corroborate all other proofs of the Divine existence, and correspond with the disclosures of revelation; but uninstructed heathen would rarely draw the inference in question from their consideration.

Let the proposition be first stated. There is a God, the Maker of men and of the universe; and let these phenomena be presented and enforced on their consideration, then the belief in a Supreme Being may be developed in them.

Dr. Chalmers further says: "This theology of conscience has done more to uphold a sense of God in the world than all the theology of academic demonstration." This may be so; but, apart from divine revelation, it may be doubted if conscience has ever demonstrated to any one the existence, to say nothing of the perfections, of God. When possessed of this knowledge, men see clearly that conscience depends upon it. But what kind of a conscience has an untutored savage? and what notion of a Supreme

Being does he infer from it?

Dr. McCosh says: "I maintain that there are a number and variety of native principles each of which, being favored by external circumstances, would lead us up to God." Ah! there is the point, "favored by external circumstances"—*e. g.*, instruction *ab extra*. He continues:

> Every deeper principle which guides us in the practical affairs of life, and in the pursuit of science, and in our obligations toward our fellow-men, prompts us to look upward to a Being to whom we stand in the closest relationship. The law of cause and effect, the law of moral good, the striving after the idea of the infinite; these, with the circumstances in which we are placed, with the traces of purpose and providence and retribution, with a generated sense of dependence, all, each in its own way and all together, would draw or drive our thoughts above nature to a supernatural power. All the living streams in our world, if we ascend them, conduct to the fountain. All the scattered rays show us the luminary. I find the materials of the argument in every work of God, and the strings that bind them in the laws or principles of knowledge, belief, and judgment. It gets its nutriment from objects, and it has its roots in the mind itself. The conviction
>
> 69
>
> springs up spontaneously in all minds. At the same time it may be repressed, or it may be perverted by ignorance, by sinful stupidity, by worldly engrossments, by pride, indisposing us to submit to restraints.

It is doubted whether this "conviction springs up spontaneously in all minds." There may be "the rudiments of it in most minds," though among savages and barbarians it is so "repressed" and "perverted" as to be of little practical benefit. Even among enlightened and highly civilized heathens the argument in question was not sufficient to keep the most of them from adopting atheism or polytheism. Paul understood this when he addressed the Athenians on Mars' Hill. He told them that they were ignorant of God—whom he declared unto them—then pertinently adduced the *a posteriori* proofs of his being, perfections, and providence; sanctioning and sealing the whole by the authority of divine revelation. (Acts xvii. 22–34.)

§ 13. Analysis and Summary.

[A brief analysis and summary of Dr. Summers's discussion may help

to a clear understanding of his teaching. He begins with a critical survey of the arguments usually adduced for the existence of God, inquiring, first, whether the knowledge of God is innate or intuitive (§§2, 3,) stating, secondly, the *a priori* reasonings of Anselm, Descartes, Clarke, and Cousin (§4), and finally presenting the *a posteriori* argument in its three branches. He now raises the question whether any or all of these arguments could convey at once the notion of God and the proof of his existence to those destitute of revelation or its remains. This cannot be put to actual test, for the knowledge of God has been in the world from the beginning: once projected within the sphere of human knowledge, it has never been lost. His own position is admirably stated in § 7. Though these several arguments do not necessarily conduct the unenlightened to the knowledge of God, yet, given even a hint of the divine existence, reason and nature afford abundant corroboration. It is one thing to make a synthesis of all the teachings of nature and reason and declare God, before unknown, to be the necessary result, and quite another thing, the existence of God being given as a proposition for proof, to gather together the evidences of it. There is no proof that the first feat has ever been accomplished by nation or individual. The discoverer of God, though a greater genius than Euclid or Newton, has not recorded his name in history.]

---

1. Pearson, "On the Creed," American Edition, pp. 26, 27. It is noteworthy that the figure of a "*tabula rasa*," so often adduced as the distinctive characteristic of Locke's doctrine, is here expressly employed by Bishop Pearson.—T.↩
2. On this passage there is this note by "P. W.:" "Those who, from the effects in the visible world, deduce the Eternal Power and Godhead of the First Cause, though they cannot attain to an adequate idea of the Deity, yet discover so much of him as enables them to see the end of their creation and the means of their happiness; whereas, they who take this high *priori* road (such as Hobbes, Spinoza, Descartes, and some better reasoners), for one that goes right, ten lose themselves in mists, or ramble after visions, which deprive them of all sight of their end, and mislead them in the choice of the means."↩
3. Professor Kuno Fischer, of Heidelberg, perhaps the most distinguished of German lecturers on modern philosophy, has recently given us (N. Y.: C. Scribner's Sons, 1887) an acute history of Descartes and his school, in which he says: "The ontological proof of Descartes is fundamentally different from the scholastic one, in spite of its parallelism with it. This difference is so important that the

usual failure to observe it is equivalent to a complete lack of insight into the system of our philosopher. Descartes must have been convinced that the objections which overthrew the scholastic argument did not touch his, since he was acquainted with them, and considered them in detail in his fifth 'Meditation.'" On the scholastic view the existence of God is thought to follow as necessarily from our notion of him, as the truth that the sum of its angles is equal to two right-angles follows from the concept of a triangle, or the equality of its radii follows from the concept of a circle. Descartes clearly saw the fallacy of an argument which inferred from existence in thought, existence in fact. "There is not a shadow of cogency in this reasoning," says Professor Bowne ("Philosophy of Theism" N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1887); "it only points out that the idea of the perfect must include the idea of existence; but there is nothing to show that the self-consistent idea represents an objective reality." Even if it be granted that the idea of God is a necessary one, the proof of the divine existence does not follow, for "so long as the idea of God is only my conception, produced by my thought, however necessarily, so long is the existence of God also only my idea." (Fischer.) It must be proved, in addition, that God himself is the only sufficient source or cause of this idea. According to Descartes, as from *"Cogito" "sum"* directly follows, so from *"Deus cogitatur" "Deus est"* is an immediate inference. The proposition *"Deus cogitatur, ergo Deus est"* is regarded by Descartes as equally certain with his fundamental truth *"cogito ergo sum."* Why? We shall let Fischer answer: "This connection between *'cogito'* and *'Deus cogitatur,'* between the certainty of self and the certainty of God, is the point to be proved and illustrated, without which the doctrine of Descartes remains misunderstood. This doctrine cannot, as usually happens, be conceived and expounded as if it first promises a method and then does not keep its promise, but leaps from the fact of self-certainty to that of causality, and then to the [usual scholastic] ontological proof of the existence of God; derives from the essence of God some of his attributes, among them veracity, and then courageously advances to the knowledge of things. ... In order to discover the methodical progress from the certainty of self to the certainty of God, we must take the expression of the first, the '*cogito*' or the '*sum cogitans*' exactly in the sense in which the philosopher conceives it and establishes it. His desire for truth requires self-examination, which results in the perception that we deceive ourselves in many instances, and, therefore, possibly in all; that we have no reason to regard any of our opinions as true; rather that we are in a state of universal uncertainty and completely destitute of the truth. . . . The Cartesian doubt is nothing else than *the certainty of this defect, of this our*

universal intellectual imperfection. In one and the same act, doubt reveals to us our thinking nature and our defective intelligence. Kot for nothing follows the '*cogito ergo sum*' immediately from the '*de omnibus dubito*.' *I am myself*, that being whose existence is immediately evident to me. *I am myself*, the being of whose possession of truth I doubt absolutely, as to whose intellectual excellence I am completely puzzled. He who finds not in the Cartesian '*cogito*' that expression of one's own thought, certain of itself, the confession of one's own complete intellectual destitution so far as the state of thought referred to in the '*cogito*' is concerned, does not understand what that sentence means, and is ignorant both of its theme and its origin." Now comes the vital point of the Cartesian argument: we both conceive a perfection which we do not possess, and we distinctly recognize ourselves as destitute of it. Fischer continues: "It is true from the idea of the imperfect—if we omit the negations—that of the perfect can be produced and brought into consciousness. But the problem is not thus solved, but only referred to the question. *How does the idea of the imperfect arise?* How do we attain to the knowledge of our own imperfection? It is one thing *to be imperfect*, another *to know that we are*. In the one case, imperfection is a state in which I am involved; in the other, it is an object which I make clear to myself. This perception, at least, is not imperfect, but is as perfect as it is true. That I am involved in self-delusion is an undoubted proof of my defects. *That I break through its barrier's and perceive my self-delusion, is an undoubted proof of a perception present in me, without which I should continue in the darkness of delusion, and the idea of my imperfection would never occur to me.* . . . There are no defects for idiots; either they find every thing good, or they condemn without discrimination. Only the critic sees imperfections; they can be apprehended only in the light of the perfect, the light which illuminates that '*via eminentia*' on which man supposes he first finds the idea of the perfect. It is no wonder that he finds it since he had it already, and had to have it, when he perceived his own imperfection. . . . The relation is now reversed, and what seemed to he the inference is in truth the ground. From the idea of the perfect springs that of the imperfect; that is *more original* than this, therefore more original than the knowledge of our own imperfection, of our own thinking being. In our certainty of God, our certainty of self has its roots. The idea of God is not merely one among others, but is the only one of its kind, because it is the source of all light. It is not merely as clear and evident as the conception of our own being, but far clearer, because it first illuminates this conception. 'It is of all our ideas,' says Descartes, 'the clearest and most distinct, and therefore the truest.'" This is the

celebrated Cartesian argument for the existence of God, as clearly, acutely, and fully analyzed by Kuno Fischer.—T.↩

4. In his “Philosophy of Theism,” Preface, p. vii., Professor Bowne says: “Teleology has taken entire possession of the language of botany and biology, especially when expounded in terms of evolution. Even plants do the most acute and farsighted things to maintain their existence. They specialize themselves with a view to cross-fertilization, and make nothing of changing species or genus to reach their ends. A supply is often regarded as fully explained when the need is pointed out; and evolution itself is not infrequently endowed with mental attributes. Such extraordinary mythology arises from the mental necessity for recognizing purpose in the world; and as it would not be good form to speak of a divine purpose, there is no shift but to attribute it to ‘Nature’ or ‘Evolution’ or ‘Law,’ or some other of the home-made divinities of the day.”—T.↩
5. It is perhaps unfortunate that the word cause, *causa*, *αἰτία*, should have been used to express any other idea than that of the agent which produces the effect—that is to say, the efficient cause—that which contains in itself the reason why another thing exists—*ens quod in se continet rationem cur alterum existat.* As Winchell says (“Reconciliation of Science and Religion,” p. 97), “Motive, material, intermediation, preconception, efficiency, being regarded as specific causes, we may abstract a general definition of cause; and we may render ourselves intelligible by using terms in such senses; but it must be constantly felt that efficient cause, in the sense as qualified, is the only cause which is underlaid by an intuition of causality; and that, though the other Aristotelian and scholastic ‘causes’ may be based on concepts some of which are invariable concomitants of our notion of causation (cause in action), it should be the conceded prerogative of the eliminated intuition of causality to sanction the employment of the term ‘cause.’ I view cause, therefore, as a single and irresolvable idea; and the use of such an expression as ‘cause in the general sense’ is an aetiological solecism.” He would abolish therefore, “except for mere convenience of phraseology, the distinction of ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ causation.” He is correct.↩

Chapter II. The Perfections of God.

I. The Unity of God.

§ 1. Introductory.

70

The article affirms, “There is but one living and true God.” There is nothing more explicitly set forth in the Scriptures than the unity of God. “Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.” (Deut. vi. 4.) “There is none other God but one.” (1 Cor. viii. 4.)

There is, to say the least, nothing in nature which opposes this principle of revealed religion. It seems to be favored by the unity which exists in the universe, and also by the absolute perfection which must be predicated of self-existence and independence. And what is absolute perfection but infinity? And there cannot be two infinite essences. A being cannot be infinitely and absolutely perfect who has not all other beings subject to him and dependent upon him; he must be alone in his glory. There can be but one God.

§ 2. First, Opposed to Polytheism.

This part of the article is leveled, first, against polytheism. It is thus in keeping with the first commandment: “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” (Ex. xx. 3.) Isaiah represents Jehovah as saying: “I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God. Is there a God besides me? yea, there is no God; I know not any.” (Isa. xliv. 6, 8.) Paul says: “We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.” (1 Cor. viii. 4–6.)

The Scriptures are so pointed against polytheism because men have been so prone to it. As the true idea of God faded from their minds they deified the powers of nature, and worshiped the host of

heaven—Sabianism being one of the earliest forms of idolatry—and then second causes, the great First Cause being so little understood. Fetichism has also been extremely prevalent in all ages and in all climes. Then hero worship came into vogue, and has continued to the present day. “An apotheosis, with rites divine,” has been granted to benefactors and warriors, and others who have achieved greatness and renown. The vilest monsters have secured to themselves divine honors. Abstract properties—virtues, vices, and the like, under the influence of hope and fear, the basest and most sensual superstition, and the shrewdest political utilitarianism—have been elevated into objects of religious veneration. Imaginary beings have swelled the pantheon to the hugest proportions, and the highest powers of invention have been taxed to form representations of them in picture and in statue; and, strange to say, the images and likenesses thus formed have received the adoration due to the one living and true God.

Even Athens, the great seat and center of ancient civilization, was wholly given to idolatry, so that they used to say that it was easier to find a god than a man in Athens!

But it is useless to refer to the mythologies of Chaldea and Persia, Canaan and surrounding nations, Greece and Rome, Scandinavia and Gaul, India and China, Africa and the Isles of the Sea, Mexico and Peru. Idolatry has been the *catholic* religion of the world, and two-thirds of its inhabitants are still the besotted worshipers of “them that are no gods.”

Among professed monotheists there are millions who transfer the affections of their hearts from the Creator to the creature; and this, according to both Scripture and reason, is spiritual, practical idolatry. (Matt. iv. 10; vi. 24; 1 John v. 21.)

Now, in contrast with all the rabble rout of false gods, which have no existence except in the besotted imaginations of their worshipers, or are only creatures like themselves, or greatly inferior to themselves, as birds and beasts and reptiles and plants and stones and metals—the work of men’s hands—we have presented to us, as the exclusive object of our religious fear and worship and love and obedience, the one living and true God.

The framers of the article seem to have had their eyes upon 1 Thessalonians i. 9: “How ye turned to God from idols, to serve the

living and true God." Thus Paul and Barnabas remonstrated with the idolaters of Lystra, when they wanted to render them divine honors: "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein." (Acts xiv. 15.)

He is the living God, in contrast with dead idols, and as he has life in himself—Jehovah, self-existent, always existent—and as he is the Source of life to the universe; for in him we live and move and have our being.

He is the true God, in contrast with all false gods, and as he is sincere in all his statements and faithful to all his engagements. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Num. xxiii. 19.) "He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he." (Deut. xxxii. 4) "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3.)

It has been thought that many of the ancients who connived at the popular polytheism were themselves monotheists; and that not a few who rendered worship to heroes, to the personified powers of nature, and the like, still reserved their highest veneration for the Supreme Being—Zeus or Jupiter, "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord"—by whatever name he might have been recognized. And it is very true that Socrates, Plato, and other philosophers, Cleanthes, Homer, and other poets, did say a great many sublime things about "Jupiter, the king of gods and men"—"for we are all his offspring"—yet their utterances were vague and uncertain and contradictory, as they recognized the popular idolatry and practiced it; and while their exoteric doctrines and practices were polytheistic, their esoteric were often atheistic. The best defense that can be made for them is made by Cudworth in his "Intellectual System;" and that leaves us still with the painful conviction that "the world by wisdom knew not God"—"who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." (1 Cor. i. 21; Rom. i. 25.)

§ 3. Secondly, Opposed to Dualism

This part of the article is opposed to dualism in all its forms, as well as to polytheism. Dualism first appears in the Zendavesta of Zoroaster. He taught that there is one supreme God—the good being—called Ormuzd; that there is a second god, an evil being, called Ahriman; and that they are each eternal, independent, and self-existent.

Plato and other Greek philosophers taught that there is one Supreme God, eternal, independent, self-existent; but that matter also is eternal, independent, and self-existent. This is nearly related to the dualism of Zoroaster.

Manes, in the third century, modified the Magian doctrine and engrafted it upon Christianity. He taught that there are two independent and eternal principles—a Supreme Being, who is the author of spiritual nature, and an inferior being, the author of matter, whom the Manicheans considered the center and source of all evil.

The Gnostics called this inferior god *Demiurgus*, the aeon that was evolved from the Supreme Being, and that created the world, and founded the Jewish system—a fantastic notion which deserves no notice.

Dualism, in all its forms, is set aside by Jehovah himself in that remarkable passage in Isaiah xlv. 5–7, which appears to have been leveled against Zoroastrianism, as it is addressed to Cyrus, the Persian king: “I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me; I girded thee, though thou hast not known me; that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things.” The context shows that natural and not moral evil is meant—not sin, but that which is designed to prevent and to punish sin.

It is obvious that the same power that wields the beneficent wields also the maleficent influences of nature. That evil angels and evil men are permitted to employ the agencies of nature for malevolent purposes is true; but this is only within a very limited and prescribed range, controlled and overruled for wise and benevolent ends, by the one only Creator, Proprietor, and Preserver of the universe.

74

This part of the article is also opposed to Tritheism, and, of course, to Tetratheism, and every other similar error. Tritheism is a perversion of Trinitarianism. The origination of Tritheism is usually attributed to John Ascusnages of Constantinople, a Monophysite and Syrian philosopher who taught, in the sixth century, that there are three equal natures or substances in the Godhead, united by no common essence. When examined by the Emperor Justinian, he is said to have acknowledged one nature of the incarnate Christ, but to have maintained that there are three natures, essences, and deities in the Trinity. Conon and Eugenius are reported to have made the same statements to the Emperor. John Philoponos of Alexandria endeavored to sustain this view by the philosophy of Aristotle. He considered the φύσις to be the genus which comprehends individuals of the same nature; ὑπόστασις, or person, to denote the separate, real existence of the nature, which the Peripatetics call ἄτομον, individual, because the separation of genus and species ceases, "He connected the two notions, φύσις and εἶδος, confounding the common divine essence with the notion of species." Hence he said we may speak of three natures as well as of three hypostases, though he did not say there are three gods. There are passages in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others of the primitive fathers, which were thought to favor Tritheism. In opposing the Monarchians they drew a sharp distinction between the three *hypostases*, which superinduced the charge of Tritheism, which Tertullian repels. The "subordination" scheme, as held by some of the early fathers, and as developed by Bishop Bull and Dr. William Sherlock, and other modern divines, has been opposed as Tritheistic by Dr. Wallis, Dr. South, and others, whose views in turn have been charged with Sabellianism and Nominalism.

Gilbert of Poitiers drew such a distinction between the *quo est* and the *quod est* in the Godhead as laid him open to the charge of *Tetratheism*. This is a development of Sabellianism. He held that the divine essence is not God, but the form by which God is God, as humanity is the form of man, but not man himself. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are one; but not in reference to the *quod est*, but

only in reference to the *quo est*, the substantial form. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one,

75

but God is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This looks at first like Tritheism, but the distinction which he drew between the *quod est*, the divine essence as such, and the three persons exposed him to the charge of *Tetratheism*; but he was not deposed, though in opposition to him Eugenius III. declared that God and the Godhead cannot be separated from one another.

As Tetratheism is the development of Sabellianism, so Tritheism is the opposite error to that specious system. Sabellius taught that there is but one person in the Godhead, with three modalities or relations. This is really a denial of the doctrine of the Trinity. On the other hand, to say that there are three distinct essences or natures in the Godhead is to say that there are three gods. But the Scripture affirms the divine unity, and if there were no alternative but Sabellianism and Tritheism, we should be forced to embrace the former; but the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in a unity of essence is a happy refuge from the Scylla of Sabellianism and the Charybdis of Tritheism.

It is needless to say that there is nothing in reason or in nature which favors in the slightest degree the heretical dogma of Tritheism, or of Tetratheism, or any other divergence from the absolute unity of the divine essence.

II. The Eternity of God.

§ 1. Introductory.

The article next affirms that God is everlasting—in the Latin *aeternus*—which means that he is without beginning of days, as he is without end of time.

In the six parts into which Bishop Burnet divides this article this point is rather strangely omitted. It is, indeed, involved in the preceding; but, as it is specifically stated in the article, it should be distinctly noted.

As Jehovah is the one living and true God, he must be eternal. If there had been a time when he did not exist he never could have

come into being. There was no other to bring him into existence, and he could not originate himself; as “out of nothing comes nothing.” There was nothing from which he could be evolved, and nothing to evolve him.

§ 2. Scriptural Proofs.

76

Paul says: “He is before all things, and by him all things consist.” (Col. i. 17.) “For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things.” (Rom. xi. 36.) Moses says: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” (Gen. i. 1.)

He existed, therefore, before all created things.

Eternity thy fountain was,
Which, like thee, no beginning knew;
Thou wast ere time began his race,
Ere glowed with stars the ethereal blue.

Thus God calls himself Jehovah, the Self-existent and Eternal Being. “I am that I am.” (Ex. iii. 14; vi. 3.) That is, as rather awkwardly but correctly paraphrased in the Geneva Bible: “The God which ever have been, am, and shall be; the God Almighty, by whom all things have their being, and the God of mercy, mindful of my promise.”

He says, sublimely: “I live forever!” (Deut. xxxii. 40.) He is “the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity.” (Isa. lvii. 15.) “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” (Rev. i. 8.) That is, says Fr. Junius on this passage: “I am he before whom there is nothing; yea, by whom everything that is made was made; and shall remain, though all they should perish.”

§ 3. The Divine Existence Necessary.

As God did not originate himself, he cannot extinguish his own being: his existence is absolutely necessary; and were it otherwise there could be no motive to induce him to commit suicide—revolting thought!—as he is “the blessed and only Potentate, the

King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." (1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.)

As all creatures were created by him, and are dependent on him, he is independent of all, and therefore his existence cannot be affected by any.

He is immutable—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

How he thus exists does not become us to inquire.

§ 4. The Eternal Now.

77

Some delight to speak of his existence as a *nunc stans*—an eternal now. Thus Dr. Dwight:

> In his existence there is no long nor short duration, nothing fleeting, nothing successive. *His duration is a mere and eternal now.* In our own existence the clearest resemblance to the duration of God is found in the contemplation of a single, present moment of our being, without taking at all into view the succession even of that which immediately follows. This doctrine is also most sublimely exhibited in that singular declaration of Isaiah: "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity"—that is, "He who fills eternity at once—who inhabits it, just as he also inhabits immensity." As he is present in all the regions of immensity at once, and does not come from the west, pass by the present place of our existence, and go to the east, so he fills eternity at once, and does not come from the past, go by the present, and enter the future.

Similarly Dr. Watts:

> His boundless years can ne'er decrease,
> But still maintain their prime:
> *Eternity*'s his dwelling-place,
> And *ever* is his time.
> While like a tide our minutes flow,
> The present and the past.
> He fills his own immortal *now*
> And sees our ages waste.

This perhaps may be allowed in poetry, as a highly wrought mode of expressing the absolute eternity and immutability of God; but when subjected to a close analysis it seems open to serious

objection. As Abernathy says: “For how can any man conceive a permanent instant which co-exists with a perpetually flowing duration? One might as well apprehend a mathematical point co-extended with a line, a surface, and all dimensions.”

Duration is simple continuance of being. It may be limited, as with us who began to be, or unlimited, as with God, who never began to be, and never will cease to be. “Duration, then,” says Richard Watson, “as applied to God, is no more than an extension of the idea as applied to ourselves; and to exhort us to conceive of it as something essentially different is to require us to conceive what is inconceivable. It is to demand us to think without ideas. Duration is continuance of existence; continuance of existence is capable of being longer or shorter, and hence necessarily arises the idea of the succession of the minutest points of duration into which we can conceive it divided.”

The Scriptures speak of the past, present, and future existence of God—who says of himself: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning

and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come.” Thus events are Past, present, or future to him as they are to us, only they are all present to his omniscience. He sees them now, but he sees them in their sequence—in the order of their occurrence. He knows them according to the reality of their occurrence, or he could not know them at all.

Perhaps the objection to succession in duration arises from confounding it with change in substance. *We* change by the flow of time; but we can conceive of an essence or substance which does not change, though there is a flow or succession in its duration. Simple duration has nothing to do with mutability or immutability; it is compatible with the former as predicated of us, and with the latter as predicated of God. This seems to be the meaning of the Psalmist in Psalm cii. 24–27: “I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days; thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.”[6]

III. The Spirituality of God.

§ 1. Polytheism Based on Anthropomorphism.

The article proceeds to state that God is “without body or parts.”

The popular polytheism, of course, in every age and among
79
every people, is based on anthropomorphism. Many of the ancient philosophers opposed this—as the Eleatics, who also opposed polytheism. The Stoics avoided anthropomorphism by considering God as merely the vital force and reason which govern the universe, though they invested them in an ethereal robe. The Epicureans said the gods possess a kind of human form, though without human appetites and passions.

§ 2. Anthropomorphism in the Early Church.

Some of the fathers seem to favor anthropomorphism. Melito of Sardis (A.D. 162) is the first Christian writer who is said to have ascribed a body to God. Tertullian ascribed a *corpus* to God, as he did materiality to the soul—not a human body, but a kind of *tertium quid*, the necessary form of all existence. He so explained the substantiality of God as to make it corporeal. The Alexandrians, and especially Origen, opposed this, and removed God from every thing within the range of the earthly and human. Among them there was an idealizing tendency which incurred the danger of dissipating the Deity into a mere abstract negation. Irenaeus judiciously says that in no respect is God to be compared to frail men; though his love justifies us in using human phraseology when speaking of him, nevertheless we feel that, as to his greatness and his true nature, he is elevated above all that is human. God is simple, and in all things like himself.

Anthropomorphism did not prevail to any great extent in the early Church, though there were some who thought that the image
80
of God is reflected in the body of man. Audaeus, an ascetic in

Mesopotamia, in the fourth century perverted this notion into gross anthropomorphism. But these revolting views of the Audians were strenuously opposed by the principal fathers of that age. Athanasius went so far in his opposition as to affirm that God is above all essence; and Augustin doubted the propriety of speaking of God as a substance. But there need be no scruples in regard to this point, as few, if any, imagine that it gives any countenance to the heresy of anthropomorphism, which finds favor with scarcely any professed Christians, except Mormons, who are Anthropomorphites of the grossest sort.7

§ 3. Is God Without "Passions?"

In the Anglican Confession this clause of the article reads, "without body, parts, or passions."

When John Wesley abridged the Thirty-nine Articles for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, he let this remain unchanged. But in 1786 the Bishops, or the Conference, omitted the word "passions," and so the article reads in our Confession, "without body or parts." The omission was made probably because of the ambiguity of the word "passions."

Bishop Burnet, in his exposition of the Articles, argues that "passions" cannot properly be predicated of the immutable Jehovah. He contends that they are attributed to God in a metaphorical sense, just as hands and feet are attributed to him. As certain operations follow from our use of hands and feet, so when similar operations are wrought by God, they are said to be effected by his hands and feet, though it is absurd and impious

to attribute such organs literally to God, who is a Spirit. So, as certain results flow from the expression of human passions, when similar results flow from the divine operation they are attributed to similar passions, though such passions cannot be predicated of the immutable Jehovah. Similar views are set forth by Archbishop King, Dr. Copleston, and others.

Richard Watson, in his "Institutes" (ii. 4), opposes those views with great force of argument. He shows that there is no analogy between the obviously metaphorical attribution of bodily organs to God and the attribution of mental affections to him. As knowledge

in God is like knowledge in man, only the latter is finite and the former is infinite, so there are passions in God like those which are in man, only they are free from all imperfection. God really loves that which is amiable and hates that which is detestable.

It might be well to bear in mind that as man was created in the image of God—that is, like God, in spirituality, intellectuality, holiness, and immortality—there must be in the divine nature the archetype of what we find in the nature of man. Now man possesses intellect, will, and affections: God, as all admit, has intellect and will; but why not affections also? We cannot, indeed, conceive of him as miserable: he might love, hate, rejoice, without involving any imperfection—any thing inconsistent with his infinite nature and immutable perfection.

In the Latin text of the Anglican Confession the term corresponding to the English "without passions" is *impassibilis*, which does not mean devoid of passions, or affections, but insusceptible of any influences which might impinge upon him, and produce results inconsistent with his immutable perfection. Any passions which do not involve imperfection may be predicated of God; but none that do so, except by an anthropopathical metaphor, which involves no difficulty.

The body of Christ was passible, and so it suffered from want of food, from toil, from laceration, and the like. The soul of Christ was passible, and so suffered from a sense of the sins committed by those whose nature he assumed, from the fierce onsets of Satan, from the bad treatment of men, from the dereliction of divine comfort—sufferings which, as they are predicated of his soul, cannot be predicated of his divinity, though the latter may have helped the former to bear them, as well as

stamped an infinite value upon them when thus vicariously endured.

Thus, in one sense, it may be said that God is "without passions," while in another sense it may be said that he has passions, without giving any countenance to Theopaschite error in any of its forms. The acutest minds have never been able to penetrate any farther into the arcana of the divine nature. We must sanctify the Lord God in our hearts, by separating him from every thing derogatory to his infinite excellence; and Lawson well observes that "God's infinite perfection includes all the most

excellent attributes—it excludes all dependency, borrowed existence, composition, corruption, mortality, contingency, ignorance, unrighteousness, weakness, misery, and all imperfections whatever; it includes necessity of being, independency, perfect unity, simplicity, immensity, eternity, immortality, the most perfect life, knowledge, wisdom, integrity, power, glory, bliss, and all these in the highest degree."

But the error of the Patripassians and Theopaschites will be more fully exposed and exploded when we shall treat of the second article—"Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very Man."

IV. The Omnipotence of God.

§ 1. Introductory.

The article proceeds to state that God is "of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness." These three perfections are specified and grouped together because all the attributes of God are necessarily blended with them, or rather are comprehended in them. All the natural attributes of God are embraced in his infinite power and wisdom, and all the moral attributes in his infinite wisdom and goodness—for wisdom partakes of both a natural and a moral character.

§ 2. Scriptural Proofs of Omnipotence.

The Scriptures abound with testimonies to the omnipotence of God. Thus Job (xlii. 21) says: "I know thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee." And Jesus says: "With God all things are possible." (Matt. xix. 26.) Indeed, one of the most common and expressive titles of the Most High is, "the Almighty." (Gen. xvii. 1; Rev. i. 8.) He says himself: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty." (Ex. vi. 3.)

As an illustration of the divine omnipotence, the Scriptures frequently refer to the universe as the work of his hands, not as if

this were the measure of its capacity, but simply as a manifestation or development of this amazing attribute of the divine nature. We might reasonably infer that a Being who can create so many worlds, place them in their orbits, cause them to roll around with so much regularity and celerity, and produce such manifold results as are witnessed in the phenomena of nature, can do every thing that he pleases. (Ps. cxv. 3; cxxxv. 6.) "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. iv. 35.)

But both Scripture and reason affirm that he is "the Lord God Omnipotent." (Rev. xix. 6.) He is the source of all the energy or force in the universe. This is emphatically stated by David: "God hath spoken once—twice have I heard this—that power belongeth unto God." (Ps. lxii. 2.) One of the capital crimes charged against the Israelites was this, that they "limited the Holy One of Israel" (Ps. lxxviii. 41.) They had witnessed displays of his omnipotence in the miracles wrought in Egypt, and in the passage of the Red Sea; and this ought to have convinced them that God could sustain them by miraculous supplies in the wilderness, but "they spoke against God; they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?" (Ps. lxxviii. 19.)

It seems reasonable to infer that he who can bring the smallest thing out of nothing can do whatsoever he pleaseth; so that there is nothing in reason to oppose the determinations of Scripture in regard to this attribute of the divine nature.

§ 3. Limitation of Divine Power Disproved.

It is, however, objected that the power of God, after all, is limited. Thus there is evil in the universe which could not proceed from him if he is a Being of infinite wisdom and goodness, as is affirmed in this article, provided he had the power to prevent it. It is also asserted in the Scriptures that God cannot lie, and that he cannot deny himself. (Heb. vi. 18; Titus i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 13.) So it is said he cannot repent—that is, break his promises. (Num. xxiii. 19.) But this is no limitation of his power: it is rather an illustration and manifestation of it.

It is no property of omnipotence to destroy itself. Who would

consider it a lack of power in God that he cannot terminate his own existence, when it is the natural and inalienable property of God to live forever, his grand excellence that he is self-existent? Death, annihilation, implies weakness; life, eternal activity, implies power.

Moral pravity also denotes weakness; the incapacity of God to sin implies power, the highest, noblest kind of power. It is conservative, not destructive. It harmonizes with all the divine perfections; and sin can be no work of power, but of weakness. The material act may, indeed, involve an outlay of energy; but that energy can be developed by a perfect Being for purposes of a benevolent character, showing that it is not for want of power that God cannot sin, but rather because he has the power to keep himself at an infinite distance from all moral evil. “Far be it from God, that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity.” (Job xxxiv. 10.)

It is not the province of omnipotence to force free moral agents to be virtuous and happy. When it is said that God cannot do this, there is no limitation of his power. It was the work of omnipotence to create free moral agents. God had the power to make all creatures, as he made some, necessary beings; but he chose to make some free moral agents, as angels and men. But it is not the work of omnipotence to perform contradictions; they imply imperfection, infirmity, which cannot be predicated of an infinitely perfect Being. God cannot make two and two equal five, or only three; he cannot make a circle square or triangular; he cannot make a substance that is extended and impenetrable, and of its own nature located at one place in one point of time, non-extended, penetrable, and ubiquitous; he cannot make any thing to be and not to be at the same time; he cannot make the past as if it had never been. All these things, and many others of a similar kind, are contradictions, absurdities, natural impossibilities, and of course are no more the predicates of omnipotence than hearing is the function of the eye, seeing the function of the ear, thinking the property of matter, or specific gravity that of the spirit.

§ 4. Potestas Absoluta and Potestas Ordinata.

[There is a definite and clear distinction between what is sometimes called the *potestas absoluta*, or the absolute power that creates all at first,

and places it under the government of secondary laws, which represent the *potestas ordinata*.

85

This distinction between the supreme and the economical omnipotence of the Creator is important in many applications. It does justice to the regular, orderly, uninterrupted process of created things, in which occasional interventions are rare, and indeed no more than exceptions to general rule. But it gives room for these interventions in creation itself, and in the miracles which sometimes introduce a new creation into the old. The one idea of the Divine Omnipotence reconciles the two and harmonizes with both. But there is another aspect of the subject before which the human mind must bow down in amazement. In the infinite wisdom of God things contrary to his will in one sense are permitted by his will in another. This leads us up to the original mystery that the Almighty created beings capable of falling from him; and down again to the present mystery that Omnipotence sustains in being creatures opposing his authority; and then forward to the same mystery, in its consummate form, that Omnipotence will preserve in being not indeed active rebels against his authority, but spirits separated from himself.[8]]

§ 5. Importance of the Doctrine.

We cannot easily overstate the importance of this divine perfection. It is constantly set forth in the Holy Scriptures as the ground of trust and confidence and hope and comfort to those who make God their friend, and the ground of fear and terror to those who make him their foe. It constitutes the subject-matter of rapturous devotion and profound adoration. “And I heard as it were the voice of great multitudes, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” (Rev. xix. 6.)

V. The Wisdom of God.

§ 1. Wisdom and Omniscience.

Infinite Wisdom, in this article, comprehends omniscience as well as its application to practical issues. Omniscience, as the word denotes, embraces all knowledge; it is not the mere capacity to

know, to acquire knowledge; but its absolute and eternal possession. It embraces all things, past, present, and future; necessary, contingent, and possible.

[Wisdom is not knowledge, though knowledge lies at the base of all genuine wisdom; and the more extensive and accurate one's knowledge, the more material has wisdom at its command for the development and completion of its ends. The highest wisdom among men must have knowledge, of one sort or another, and usually of many sorts, at its service; and divine wisdom,

which is the only absolute wisdom, is dependent for its exercise upon the exhaustless stores of infinite knowledge: this is Dr. Summers's meaning when he says above that wisdom includes omniscience. To predicate ignorance of God is to set metes and bounds to his wisdom and action. Wisdom, therefore, involves the power to bring knowledge into proper exercise. It implies the selection of the highest ends, and the ability to choose the best means for the attainment of those ends; and since wisdom always looks to action, action dominated by it, it is the combination, not only of far-sighted intellectual, but also of the most exalted moral, qualities. If wisdom is correctly defined as the choice and use of the best means to attain the highest ends, the wisdom of God in exercise is but the equivalent of the providence of God; and the providence of God embraces his perfect government over the physical and moral universes.

Nature, or natural law, has in itself neither intelligence nor efficiency; and since we see all around us operations which imply the presence of both intelligent design and efficient cause; and, furthermore, since intelligence resides only in mind, and efficiency only in will, mind and will being distinguishing attributes of personality, we are led to posit the existence of an intelligent and powerful person; and this Person is God. The infinite wisdom of God is displayed in his physical government by the uniformity and permanency of the laws of nature. If God be infinitely wise, *once for all*, "in the beginning," he would make final and irreversible selection of the very best methods for the attainment of the highest possible ends of physical creation. And this is what unvarying nature evidences: if there be special difficulties when we descend to details, we must turn them over to theodicy, and the above must stand as the general Christian interpretation of nature.

The moral government of God is no less a certain government than the physical, but this certainty is not the certainty of necessitated uniformity. By so much as the immortal interests of morally responsible intelligences are of more value in the sight of God than all the suns in space, are we directed to exclude from the moral government of God every element of chance or unprovided-for calamity. The omniscience, or the all-embracing and eternal foreknowledge, of God, therefore, which is throughout the Scriptures ascribed to him, and by

which the end is known from the beginning, becomes necessary as the only sufficient foundation for his perfect moral government. The moral decrees, or divine plan of action, founded on this eternal and perfect foreknowledge, constitute a *Biblical idea* of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. God ordained the hidden wisdom before the world unto our glory. The gospel is the revelation of a mystery which was kept secret since the world began; for we are saved with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world. When man fell, no enlargement of the scope of the divine administration, which had been ordered from eternity, was necessary, for the remedy stood ready, embraced in the original scheme, to meet the foreseen emergency. No unprovided-for catastrophe thwarts the Creator and Governor, for it is eternally impossible that God should be taken by surprise. God does not alter his purposes, in time, to suit unforeseen circumstances, for he hath put all things under the feet of Christ, and given him to be the head over all things unto the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. All creation and all history are in view of the cross of Christ, for all things are by him and for him: he is before all things, and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the body, the Church. O that "all men" might "see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord!"

To conceive the Divine Being either as ignoring or as acting contrary to his foreknowledge, is to represent him as disregarding

the simplest dictates of sagacity and prudence, and as rendering useless—indeed, impertinent—the attribute of omniscience with which he is endowed. The Scriptures represent omniscience as an original or underived attribute of the Deity, just as his omnipotence and other perfections are: as such it is the prerequisite and foundation of his predestination. Calvinism labors under the disadvantage of representing omniscience—a divine attribute—as dependent upon and resulting from fore-ordination—a divine act, or determination of the divine will. If omniscience

belongs to the essential nature of God—which is not in dispute—and if predestination is a determination of the divine will—conceded to be eternal—nevertheless the divine nature, which is, of course, indivisible, must be conceived as existing in its entirety at the time of the performance of any divine act. Even if the element of time or succession be wholly eliminated, as it must be in all things pertaining to the nature and purposes of God, and omniscience and predestination are truly viewed as both being alike eternal, omniscience is, nevertheless, by the natural processes and inviolable necessities of our human thinking with respect to the relation of being and action, the causal ground or antecedent of predestination (as we commonly speak), and not predestination the causal ground or antecedent of omniscience. A mutilated God, destitute of an essential attribute, except as it is supplied by his voluntary act, is a monstrosity. The divine nature must exist in its completeness *when* it enters upon its career of positive activities. No Calvinist denies the foreknowledge of God—that denial has always been saddled upon Arminianism as one of its foolish and wicked devices.[9] If no predestinarian denies God's foreknowledge—which is original, underived as shown above—will any be found bold enough to affirm that God ignores it? If he did ignore it, instead of ascribing infinite wisdom to him, we should have to lay the charge of foolishness at the door of God, in that he deliberately counts out, in the scheme of his moral government, the factors which his omniscience thrusts upon his attention.]

§ 2. Omniscience.

Thus the Holy Scriptures speak of the divine knowledge: “O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising; thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassest my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.” (Ps. cxxxix. 1–4.) “Great is our Lord, and of great power; his understanding is infinite.” (Ps. cxlvii. 5.) “Lord, thou knowest all things.” (John xxi. 17.) “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.” (Acts xv. 18.) This knowledge is all-perfect, as it is all-comprehending—embracing every act, word, and thought of every being in the universe, and every object and event, actual or possible—as he knows how in all imaginable circumstances free agents would choose and act.

In light thou dwell’st—light that no shade,
No variation ever knew;
Heaven, earth, and hell stand all displayed,
And open to thy piercing view.

He has not only the knowledge of simple intelligence, apprehending with certainty whatever is possible, but also the knowledge of vision, by which at a glance he sees all the transactions of eternity in the exact order of their occurrence.

§ 3. Omniscience Actual, not Potential, Knowledge.

It is actual, not potential, knowledge—not the mere capacity of knowing—as if he knew with absolute certainty all necessary events, but was voluntarily ignorant of contingent events. This absurd hypothesis was invented to avoid the difficulty of reconciling prescience with free agency. But there is no difficulty in this; indeed, no reconciliation is needed. What has knowledge, divine or human, to do with free agency? Nothing whatever. Necessary events are foreknown as necessary, contingent events as contingent; their certainty is in the mind foreseeing, not in the events themselves. Thus the prophecy of events, whether necessary or contingent, is only their anticipated history. As are the events, so is their history, not *vice versa*. If moral agents choose to act in a

given way, their actions are foreseen and predicted accordingly, or, after their occurrence, are historically recorded as they occurred. The foresight and prediction have no more influence on their occurrence than the

remembrance or historical record of them. But were it otherwise, the expedient in question would not relieve the matter, as it is in itself contradictory; for if God chooses not to know certain things there must be a reason for his ignoring of them; but he must know what they are, in order to know why he should not know them.

But it is useless to argue the question, as the Scripture records numerous predictions of contingent events, free actions of men, good and bad, for which they are held accountable and rewarded or punished, thus demonstrating that some events are not absolutely predestinated and necessary, but contingent and free, and yet as perfectly known to God before their occurrence as after—as perfectly as if they were unconditionally predestinated and necessary.

It is therefore astonishing that one so acute as the Chevalier Ramsay should hold that omniscience is merely the capacity to know, and not actual knowledge of all things; and that one greater than he, the illustrious Calvin, should teach that there are no contingencies—no actions performed by free moral agents, who have the power of alternate choice—but that all things whatsoever that come to pass are absolutely predestinated by God, who knows them simply because he has thus fore-ordained them. Paul says expressly that those whom God predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son are those whom he did foreknow as complying with the prescribed conditions of realizing so great a benefit.

§ 4. Divine Wisdom.

But the infinite wisdom of God is specially seen in the application of his omniscience to practical purposes—the choice of the best means for the accomplishment of the most desirable ends. As the great First Cause, he has chosen both ends and means.

As he is infinite in power, and his resources are inexhaustible, it may be inferred that both ends and means are worthy of a God. Thus the Scripture: “He is wise in heart and mighty in strength: who

hath hardened himself against him, and hath prospered?" "He is mighty in strength and wisdom." (Job ix. 4; xxxvi. 5.) "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all." (Ps. civ. 24.) "This also cometh forth from the Lord of hosts, which is wonderful in counsel and

excellent in working." (Isa. xxviii. 29.) "The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens. By his knowledge the depths are broken up, and the clouds drop down the dew." (Prov. iii. 19; *cf.* viii.) "For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him." (2 Chron. xvi. 9.) "He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence." "The manifold wisdom of God." (Eph. i. 8; iii. 10.) "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen." "To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever. Amen." (Rom. xi. 33–36; xvi. 27.) "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen." (1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25.)

These passages—and the number could be indefinitely multiplied—show that in the creation and government of the material world, and in all the arrangements in the moral world, the infinite wisdom of God is displayed in the choice of the most suitable means for the realization of the most desirable ends. The ends continually kept in view are the highest possible good of the universe and the glory of the Creator.

Finite minds, indeed, cannot tell what is best in all circumstances, and what, in every case, are the best means to reach the proposed end. But from what we know of the character of God, as seen in his works, and revealed in his word, we can infallibly infer that in those things which transcend our faculties, and which seem to conflict with reason and rectitude, there is as much wisdom as in those which lie more within the range of our comprehension.

§ 5. Infinite Wisdom Illustrated in the Universe.

Speaking after the manner of men, we can clearly see that God has always an object or end in view which is worthy of himself, and that he employs suitable means to realize that end. This is seen in the cosmical arrangements of the universe. At a given point in eternity, God created the universe according to an idea

or plan in bis own mind. In doing this he adjusted one part to another, one orb to another orb, to all other orbs, and every atom of each to every other, so as that there should result a perfect harmony throughout the whole. By the one simple law of gravitation stamped upon every atom of the universe a centripetal tendency is given to all matter of every kind; while the centrifugal force, which is operative upon all the worlds of which the universe is composed, causes them to revolve with so much celerity and so precise regularity in their respective orbits around their common center.

Those mighty orbs proclaim thy power,
Their motion speaks thy skill.

We can see a thousand beneficent ends encompassed by these astounding cosmical arrangements.

In the infancy of science, before the universe was so extensively explored as it is now by the telescope, microscope, and spectroscope, men could not fail to see and admire the manifold wisdom of God as displayed in the works of creation. Thus the Psalmist praises “him that by wisdom made the heavens, stretched out the earth above the waters, made great lights, the sun to rule by day and the moon and stars to rule by night.” (Ps. cxxxvi. 5–9.)

Solomon, by a bold and beautiful *prosopopaeia*, makes Wisdom say: “When he prepared the heavens, I was there; when he set a compass upon the face of the depth; when he established the clouds above; when he strengthened the fountains of the deep; when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment; when he appointed the foundations of the earth, then I was by him.” (Prov. viii. 27–30.)

But how infinitely varied is the wisdom of God as displayed in the universe brought to light by the discoveries of modern science! By the telescope, microscope, and spectroscope we have revealed to us the immensity of creation, in the millions of ponderous orbs

which move in space, the wonderful microcosms into which they are infinitesimally divided, and the reign of law which pervades the whole.

Into what multiplied, varied, beautiful, and useful forms, are cast the sixty-five elements into which matter is divided in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms! One great all-pervading and harmonizing law operates upon them all. Chemistry demonstrates the action of this law in the combination of the elements

in precise proportions for the production of every object in nature.

Thus the different species are preserved intact—never transmuted—the never-failing law is in operation for the production and development of all their wonderful forms and properties of utility and of beauty. All the ends they answer, the infinite wisdom of the Creator alone can tell. We can discover much, but only an infinitesimal part; but as science advances we discover new uses and "new beauties" "with still increasing light." We say "new beauties;" for the esthetic ends of creation are as much deserving our notice and admiration as the utilitarian.

Go where we will—to the all but impenetrable jungle and inaccessible mountain, the barren desert and the unfathomed depths of ocean—and every object we find, when submitted to the test of the laboratory, or placed under the microscope, reveals the most curious forms, the most wonderful contrivances, or the most exquisite colors, so that we are forced to exclaim, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all!"

We cannot here descend to particulars; nor is it necessary, as so many works, like "Paley's Natural Theology," the "Bridgewater Treatises," and more modern works, based on the marwelous discoveries of science in our day, have discussed these interesting themes.

§ 6. Design Manifest in the Human Body.

It is difficult to see how an anti-teleologist can be sincere, if he is sane. If a man has any sense, he must see final causes—means tending to certain ends—in operation in every thing around him; nay, in every thing within him. "I will praise thee," says David, "for

I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well." (Ps. cxxxix. 14.) No man who looks at himself can help knowing it. Anthropology settles the question.

Look at man—the species, the varieties, the individual. As a species man continues intact, unchanged, and, so far as science can testify, unchangeable. The *anthrop* never was an *anthropoid*—never will be any thing but the human being he always has been. The varieties of the *genus homo*—for there is but one species—are innumerable. Within certain well-defined limits there are amazing differences of size and form, feature and color, with mental and moral peculiarities equally diversified; but they are

all "of one blood;" all have a common nature; all are capable of fruitful commixtures; and all are susceptible of wonderful development or degradation. Every individual of every variety, of the entire species—fossilized, mummified, or modern—exhibits the same constituents with all the rest. All are the result of the same procreating process; all pass through the same stages—fetal, infantile, adolescent—to maturity, senility, and death, except as life in many cases is abbreviated by laws of certain operation. Every individual has an osseous, a muscular, a nervous, a vascular, a visceral, a cutaneous system—all blended into one harmonious whole, each ministering to the ends of the other, and all alike in all, according to sex and age. Select any organ, any function; examine it closely, the more thoroughly the better, and see its structure, and note its uses: the marks of design are so obvious that no sane man can fail to see them, and no sincere man can fail to acknowledge them.

Was not the hand made for manipulation? Why the digits? Why the opposing thumb? Why the flexible joints? Was not the spine, with its twenty-four vertebrae, made to support the body, and at the same time to bend it—to give support to the ribs and protection to the spinal marrow? And was it not furnished with processes to prevent luxation? Are there no certain ends and marks of design in all this? Was not the ear, with its wonderful and beautiful contrivances, constructed for hearing? Was not the eye, with its still more exquisite mechanism, designed for seeing?[10] Was not the brain compounded for the express purpose

95
of being employed for the reception of impressions from the external world, and of transmitting them to others by voice, gesture, and other means adapted directly to the purpose? Are there not stupendous marks of design in all the provisions and arrangements for the preservation of the individual and of the species? But it would be an endless task to seek out and set in order the proofs of design in the universe. “Lo, these are parts of his ways;” but “how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!”

§ 7. Design Evident in Man’s Spiritual Nature.

The Bible tells us, “There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” (Job xxxii. 8.)

96
We cannot allow that man’s spiritual nature is nothing but the result of organization—that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile. But suppose this were the case, how can matter be so fearfully and wonderfully organized as to produce mental phenomena? In every man there is the combination of intellect, sensibilities, and will, and the properties and processes and results of these faculties are so manifold and varied that they baffle description, and they are so wonderful that they elicit the highest admiration. There is as much design displayed in these phenomena, viewed as the result of an exquisite material organization and life-force—irrational as is this hypothesis—as there is viewed in the true light, as predicated of our immaterial substance, which we call soul or spirit. They demonstrate the working of an infinitely wise Creator: not a mere force, blind, unconscious, natural selection. “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see?” “he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?” (Ps. xciv. 9, 10.) What marvelous wisdom is manifested in the mysterious union of the body and the soul! What wonderful adaptations of the one to the other! By an act of the will a congeries of muscles and nerves is set in operation to minister to the wants and demands of the soul, which is thus put into connection with the external world in a thousand different ways. The man must be stone blind who can see no teleological arrangement in all this.

Then there is the capacity of man for morals and religion, in which he is distinguished from the beasts that perish. He has a conscience which dictates to him what should be done, and warns him what not to do, which commends or accuses according as he obeys or disobeys its behests. He has a spiritual faculty by which he can receive divine inspirations and revelations, and look through nature up to nature's God. He can realize the sense of duty and responsibility, and anticipate the retributions of a future state of existence.

§ 8. Divine Wisdom in Redemption.

Through the abuse of his moral freedom he can sin, and by the provisions of recovering mercy he can repent of his sin, and obtain forgiveness and power to overcome the weakness of his fallen nature and the force of temptation, and lead a life of piety and virtue. In nothing else does the wisdom of God so shine forth as in the government of free moral agents, and the wonderful

scheme of redemption devised to save a world of sinners lost.

By this remedial plan all the divine attributes are held in harmony in the salvation of sinners, the stability of God's moral government is sustained, and sinners are restored to their forfeited estate of holiness and happiness without impinging upon their freedom or relaxing their bonds of moral obligation. Well may the apostle call this "the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory" (1 Cor. ii. 7.); and in another place, "the manifold wisdom of God," which has called forth the highest admiration and the profoundest praises of the "principalities and powers in heavenly places" (Eph. iii. 10.)

§ 9. Dr. Dwight's Definition.

Dr. Dwight is therefore correct when he says, "Wisdom is a compound attribute, being made up of knowledge to discern, and the disposition to choose good ends and means. The wisdom of God is formed therefore of this omniscience and benevolence, united in

planning and accomplishing all real good in the progress of his immense and eternal kingdom."

VI. The Goodness of God.

§ 1. Divine Goodness Defined.

The article proceeds to state that God is a being of infinite goodness. The term used in the Latin recension is *bonitas*. This is not merely the opposite of malevolence or maleficence; it is not simply benevolence or beneficence.

Goodness is the opposite of badness, *vitium, pravitas*. When applied to God, as in this article, it comprehends all his moral perfections, nearly or quite the same as when John speaks of him in his first Epistle: "God is light"—alluding to his moral nature—and "God is love"—not merely benevolence, but essential goodness, rectitude, moral perfection. Christ says, "There is none good but one, that is God." (Matt. xix. 17.) As paraphrased by Bishop Pearson, there is "None originally, essentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatsoever goodness is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whose very being is diffusive; whose nature consists in the communication of itself."

Bishop Burnet says:

> God is original goodness, all perfect and happy in himself, acting and seeing every thing in a perfect light; and he having made rational beings capable of some degrees of his light, purity, and perfection, the first and primary act of goodness is to propose to them such means as may raise them to these, to furnish them with them, to move them oft to them, to accept and to assist their sincere endeavors after them. A second act of goodness, which is but in order to the first, is to pity those miseries into which men fall, as long us there is any principle or possibility left in them of their becoming good, though surprise and strong temptations prove too hard for them.

"Thou art good, and doest good," says the Psalmist. (Ps. cxix. 68.) His nature corresponds to his name—God—which means good.

Thy nature and thy name is Love.

His goodness is both essential and relative.

His essential goodness is usually styled his holiness. This denotes moral integrity. It comprehends the exclusion of all moral imperfection and the possession of all moral excellence. It is the source of all the righteousness in the universe. The Psalmist says: "The righteous Lord loveth righteousness." (Ps. xi. 7.)

There is a perfect agreement in his nature with the fitness of things, as seen in the expression of his will, his law—which is a transcript of his nature. "For the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good." (Rom. vii. 12.)

His moral perfection, like his natural, is unoriginated, absolute, infinite, indefectible. He would cease to be God if he ceased to be holy. He is "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy." (Isa. lvii. 15.) Christ addresses him as "Holy Father." (John xvii. 11.) He is frequently styled "the Holy One," and "the Holy One of Israel." (Deut. xxxiii. 8; 2 Kings xix. 22.)

The sacred writers never grow weary in celebrating the moral perfections of Jehovah. "Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" (Ex. xv. 11.) "There is none holy as the Lord." (1 Sam. ii. 2.) "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy." (Lev. xix. 2.) "And one [seraph] cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." (Isa. vi. 3.) And the four living ones "rest not day and night, saying. Holy,

holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." (Rev. iv. 8.) "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy." (Rev. xv. 4.) God alone is absolutely, independently holy; his moral nature is the archetype and source of all the holiness in the universe.[11]

Holy as thou, O Lord, is none!
Thy holiness is all thy own:
A drop of that unbounded sea
Is ours—a drop derived from thee.
And when thy purity we share.
Thy only glory we declare;
And humbled into nothing own,

Holy and pure is God alone.

§ 3. God's Relative Goodness.

The divine goodness is relative as well as essential.

If God operates at all, what he does must be good. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit." It is as absurd as it is blasphemous to say that God is the author of sin—as much as to say, "There is no God." When God put forth his creating power he pronounced all his creatures "good," and man especially "very good." The goodness of God is equally displayed in the conservation

and government of the universe. "For the word of the Lord is right, and all his works are done in truth. He loveth righteousness and judgment: the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." (Ps. xxxiii. 4, 5.) "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; thy judgments are a great deep; O Lord, thou preservest man and beast. How excellent is thy loving-kindness, O God! therefore the children of mem put their trust under the shadow of thy wings." (Ps. xxxvi. 5–7.) "The goodness of God endureth continually." (Ps. lii. 1.) But the Bible is full of such representations of the Deity which correspond to his "Name," as he proclaimed it to Moses: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin; and that will by no means spare the guilty." (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7.)

According to this scriptural representation of the goodness of God, relatively considered, it embraces the elements of truth, justice, and benevolence.

§ 4. The Divine Truth.

By truth is meant conformity to fact. It divides itself into (1) veracity and (2) faithfulness. (1) Veracity is "the invariable expression of truth," as seen in all God's communications to his creatures. (2) Faithfulness is his strict adherence to all engagements.

There can be no reason for God's deceiving his creatures, as he

cannot be deceived by them. His knowledge is infinite, so that he cannot be mistaken, and his holiness is perfect, so that he can have no disposition to deceive; thus there must be sincerity

in all his dealings with his creatures. His resources are infinite, so that there can be no reason for his violating any of his engagements. Thus he is necessarily

Faithful in his promises,
And in his threatenings too.

So of the doctrines he reveals. There need be no misgivings in regard to them, as if there were a possibility that in the progress and development of science they might be found inconsistent with the reality of things. There can be no counsel against the Lord. *We* may misinterpret his oracles, but *they* are never false. So with regard to the divine legislation. It corresponds precisely with the nature of God, and is exactly adapted to the character and condition of his subjects. Being a transcript of his nature, his law is unchangeable. "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness and thy law is the truth." "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." (Ps. cxix. 142, 160.) This lays down the solid basis for our faith and hope and love. Without this there could be no religion. If God were not true in all his communications and engagements we should not know what to believe, what to desire, what to do. If he were false and fickle like the gods of the heathen, or like fallen man, fealty, which is essential to religion, would be impossible. But he is the very opposite of this. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Num. xxiii. 19.) "He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he." "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges." (Deut. xxxii. 4, 31; *cf.* Ps. xcii. 15.) "Thy truth reacheth unto the clouds." (Ps. cviii. 4.) "The truth of the Lord endureth forever." (Ps. cxvii. 2.) "Thy faithfulness is unto all generations." (Ps. cxix. 90.) "My covenant will I not break; nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." (Ps. lxxxix. 34.) "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." (Mal. iii. 6.) "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the

truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." (Rom. xv. 8.) "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord." (1 Cor. i. 9.)

"If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself." (2 Tim. ii. 13.) "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Titus i. 2.) "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." (Heb. vi. 17–19.) "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (James i. 17.) "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments." (Rev. xvi. 7.) The foregoing scriptures are but a specimen of Biblical testimonies respecting the truth of God. The sacred writers take delight in expatiating upon this glorious attribute of "the only true God." (John xvii. 3.)

When the Scriptures speak of God as "deceiving" men, they only mean that he suffers those "who receive not the love of the truth that they might be saved" to be deluded, and to "believe a lie, and be damned." (1 Kings xxii. 19–23; 2 Thess. ii. 9–12.)

When it is said that God breaks his promise, changes his mind, repents, and the like, it is only meant that he alters his conduct toward his creatures to suit their altered character and conduct—a fact which strikingly illustrates his faithfulness; for if he did not change in his bearing toward them, to suit their altered character and conduct, he would have to change his nature and the principles of his moral government, which would be inconsistent with the attribute in question. But he does thus vary his dispensations toward his creatures. "With the merciful thou wilt shew thyself merciful; with an upright man thou wilt shew thyself upright; with the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure, and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward. For thou wilt save the afflicted people; but wilt bring down high looks." (Ps. xviii. 25–27.) Agreeably to these principles, God says: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down,

and to destroy it: if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto

them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it: if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." (Jer. xviii. 7–10.)

The Ninevite and the Hebrew kingdoms are patent illustrations of these equitable principles of the divine government—Jonah, *passim*. (Ps. lxxxix. 28–37.) Notwithstanding the covenant, the disobedient descendants of David were severely chastised, though for Messianic reasons the covenant remained in force until the coming of Jesus, when it received its grand fulfillment in him and his faithful followers, to the exclusion of those "children of the kingdom" who "received him not" as the Messiah—a most pregnant illustration of the veracity and faithfulness of God. (Matt. viii. 11, 12; xxi. 35–46; Rom. xi.)

§ 5. The Divine Justice.

Another modification of goodness is justice, or righteousness; that is, the exact rectitude of God in dealing with the subjects of his moral government. It is divided into (1) *legislative* and (2) *distributive*.

1. *Legislative justice* prescribes the duty of the subject and the sanctions to enforce its performance. It is based upon the principle of God's unquestionable and absolute right to the obedience of the creatures that he has made. The rectitude of his legislation may be inferred from his essential, subjective holiness. Its adaptation to his creatures may be inferred from his infinite wisdom. Its beneficent tendency and result may be argued from the opulence of his resources and the benevolence of his nature. All these points are corroborated by ample testimony of the Scriptures, and the experience of all the moral subjects of God's empire. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God!" (Mic. vi. 8.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is

the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. xxii. 37–40.) "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should

do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." (Matt. vii. 12.)

That admirable summary of moral law, the Decalogue, has commended itself by its obvious equity and pertinency to the approval of all men to whom it has been made known and by whom it has been cordially studied. The Divine Law-giver cannot be "a hard master" if all the law is fulfilled in one word, love. (Gal. v. 14; Rom. xiii. 8–10; James ii. 8.) This is precisely adapted to the nature of man, and cannot but be pleasing to the loving God and Father of the universe: it must tend to the harmony and happiness of all the subjects of his moral government. "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." (1 John iv. 16.) Thus "to glorify God" is "to enjoy him forever." In man's fallen condition he cannot, indeed, keep the law, as he is "cursed with a want of love." But by "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," his forfeited capacity of obedience may be restored. Hence "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." (Acts xvii. 30, 31.) "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, ... if I have done iniquity, I will do no more." (Job xxxiv. 31, 32.) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John vi. 29.)

How can pardon and peace be received by a penitent sinner except by faith in Christ? If we are justified by faith and thus have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; if we are sanctified by faith, which worketh by love and purifieth the heart; if we are saved by faith, so that by its action, through the power of the Holy Ghost, we can lovingly and joyously do the whole will of God—can any man fail to see that the faith thus required is at once our duty and delight? There can be no law without sanctions. Even Juvenal said. *Nemo malus felix*, No wicked man is happy—so no good man can be miserable. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the

statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes; the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true

and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward." (Ps. xix. 7–11.) "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." (1 John v. 3.) On the other hand: "It is an evil thing and bitter, that thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God, and that my fear is not in thee, saith the Lord God of hosts." (Jer. ii. 19.) In part, therefore, the sanctions of God's law are the natural results of obedience and of transgression. "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Isa. iii. 10, 11.)

2. The *Distributive justice* of God has reference to positive rewards and punishments, rendered to moral agents according to their character and conduct. Over and above the natural rewards of obedience there are remunerations, positive rewards; and over and above the natural punishments of disobedience, there are vindictive, positive punishments, administered precisely according to the deserts of moral agents. Thus the angels "that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word," those "ministers of his, that do his pleasure" (Ps. ciii. 20, 21), "always see his face" and bask in his smiles; while "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.) So with men. "This do, and thou shalt live." "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. ii. 17.) "For the work of a man shall he render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways." He "accepteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the rich more than the poor, for they are all the work of his hands." (Job xxxiv. 11, 19.) "Thou renderest to every man according to his work." (Ps. lxii. 12; Prov. xxiv. 12.) "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." (Prov. xi. 31.)

Under the Jewish theocracy temporal rewards and punishments were more visibly and constantly administered than under this

dispensation; but still there were inequalities in the administration pf providence which painfully exercised the

minds of men, as Asaph in Psalm lxxiii. The difficulty cannot be solved without reference to the retributions of the future state. This clears it all up. “Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” (Eccl. xii. 13, 14.) God “will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law [the written revelation] shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” (Rom. ii. 6–16.) “For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” (2 Cor. v. 10.) “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.” (Gal. vi. 7, 8.) “Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor.” (1 Cor. iii. 8.) “God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love.” (Heb. vi. 10.)

This principle of impartial, distributive justice is not weakened, but rather strengthened, by the plan of salvation. God’s regard to rectoral justice is seen in the sacrifice of his Son—“whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Having laid down the principle on which sins may be forgiven, and sinners be restored to the favor and image of God, nothing can be more equitable than the sentence, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (Mark xvi. 16.) “If we confess our

sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

107

(1 John i. 9.) Obedient believers will be rewarded for every virtuous act which, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, they perform; and incorrigible sinners who neglect the great salvation will be justly punished for every act of disobedience, including that which is the sum and source of all their guilt, and the just cause of their condemnation—the rejection of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii. 36.)

From these scriptures—and hundreds more of the same sort might be cited—it is clear that the distributive justice of God will mete out to every moral agent in his vast empire rewards or punishments, according to his character and conduct, with the utmost exactitude and impartiality. Retribution belongs less to the probationary than to the eternal state, in the nature of the case. Here it is partial, unequal; there it will be equal and perfect; but in what it will consist and how it will be administered—what will be the rewards of heaven and the punishments of hell—we know not; except this we know, that the judgment of God will be according to truth, and that the "Judge of all the earth will do right." (Gen. xviii. 25.)

The distributive retributions of providence respecting nations take place in the present world, and history furnishes ample illustrations thereof. In the nature of the case, it is frequently difficult to trace the operation and development of this principle, as the machinery of providence is so complicated, vast, and mysterious. The mill of God grinds slowly, but it grinds surely and with the greatest precision. In the long run the language of the prophet shall be verified: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." (Isa. Ix. 12.)

§ 6. The Divine Benevolence.

Benevolence is another modification of goodness. This attribute is developed in (1) *complacency* toward the good and happy; (2)

compassion toward the unfortunate; and (3) *mercy* toward the wicked.

(1) Being essentially good, he cannot but take delight in goodness. He loveth everything that he hath made, because it is good.

"The Lord loveth the righteous." (Ps. cxlvi. 8.) He loves them with a love of complacency or esteem.

> But saints are lovely in his sight,
> He views his children with delight;
> He sees their hope, he knows their fear,
> He looks and loves his image there.

(2) He has compassion toward the unfortunate. "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion." (Ps. cxlv. 8.) "His compassions fail not." (Lam. iii. 22.) "Which executeth judgment for the oppressed; which giveth food to the hungry. The Lord looseth the prisoners; the Lord openeth the eyes of the blind; the Lord raiseth them that are bowed down: the Lord loveth the righteous; the Lord preserveth the strangers; he relieveth the fatherless and widow." (Ps. cxlvi. 7–9.) "The Lord is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works." "The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raiseth up all those that be bowed down. The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." (Ps. cxlv. 9, 15, 16.) "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." (Ps. ciii. 13.) "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." (Ps. 1. 15.) But the Bible is full of testimonies of this sort. There is what may be called a maternal στοργή in the nature of God, causing him to brood over his helpless and dependent creatures, so that "he giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry."

> But mostly thou delight'st to bless
> Thy favorite creature, man.

"As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you." (Isa. lxvi. 13.) By a striking and affecting anthropopathy he is represented as sharing the distresses of those who are in trouble. "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them." (Isa.

lxiii. 9.)

(3) He is merciful toward the wicked. “Who remembered us in our low estate; for his mercy endureth forever.” (Ps. cxxxvi. 23.) “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him

might be saved.” (John iii. 16, 17.) “For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” (Rom. v. 6–9.) “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.” (Isa. lv. 7.) “But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy lie saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost: which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” (Titus iii. 4–7.) “Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth in mercy.” (Micah vii. 18.) These testimonies could be multiplied a hundred-fold; but it is needless to adduce them. Nothing is clearer than that “the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.” (Ps. cxlv. 9.) He has made ample provision for the salvation of a whole world of sinners lost, for Jesus Christ by God’s favor tasted death for every man. (Heb. ii. 9.) “The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him; for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” (Rom. x. 12, 13.) Hence the pertinency of the General Thanksgiving. “Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we thine unworthy servants do give thee most humble and hearty thanks for all thy goodness and loving-kindness to us and to all men. We bless thee for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life, but above all for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the

world by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory."

The Lord, the mighty God, thou art;
But let me rather prove
That name inspoken to my heart,
That favorite name of Love.

---

1. Dr. Pope ("Compendium," I., 296–300) advocates the contrary view. After citing the two texts in which God is denominated the God of eternity (Gen. xxi. 33, אֵל עוֹלָם, and Isa. xl. 28, אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם, and admitting that "all the terms generally used carry with them the notion of successive duration," and fall short of what he denominates "the pure conception of the eternal," Dr. Pope continues: "But the perfect idea of eternity, as it is in the human mind, cannot tolerate duration or succession of thoughts as necessary to the Divine consciousness. And this is the deep perplexity of our human intellect, which, however, must accept the profound meaning of the name I AM, as teaching an eternal now enfolding and surrounding the successive existence of time. The personal Jehovah once, and once only, declared his pure eternity. His name is the only word which human language affords in its poverty to express that thought: such terms as eternal and everlasting have temporal notions clinging to them. . . . But I AM—before time or space was, I AM—has in it all the strength of eternity. It is literally the assertion of pure existence without distinction of past and present and future. . . . The deepest thinkers of all ages have consented to annihilate in the Divine essence all that we mean by time and succession of thought. They have agreed to speak of a *Duratio tota simul*, of an *Aeternitas* in which *fuisse et futurum esse non est sed Solum Esse*. . . . When we are pointed to the tenor of scriptural representations that speak of the Eternal as having purposes which have been fulfilled, and are in course of fulfillment, our reply must be cautiously and yet boldly given. Time is the creation of the Eternal God, who *made the ages*. (Heb. i, 2.) It is, with all its endless phenomena and laws, a reality to him who brought it into being; and all its succession unfolds in his presence as past and present and future. Our only difficulty is to hold fast the truth that he sustains two relations to time. . . . This is of course a deep mystery to human thought: that is, to conceive of eternal willing and temporal acting of a timeless and successionless agent working out and watching the

evolution of his plans. But the mystery, such as it is, is only that of the incarnation anticipated. . . . We may dare to say that the Eternal inhabits eternity; and yet that in the Son, the First-born before every creature, he inhabits time also. As in the incarnation God is manifest in the flesh, so in the creation God is manifest in time."—T.↩

2. The Rev. W. C. Pond, speaking of a discourse which he had heard from the late Brigham Young, says: "Toward the close of his discourse he unfolded the doctrine of God for which the world is indebted to this 'Latter-day' revelation. 'Till now,' he said, 'men have talked about, or tried to worship, a Being whose center is everywhere and circumference nowhere. But we know that there can be no such Being. It is all inconceivable and absurd. We worship a God that is somebody, that has a form, with feet and hands and lips and eyes and ears and forehead and cheek-bones, a God that lives somewhere and does some things, not such a vague nonentity as men talk about elsewhere. And the missionaries that have the opportunity to learn of us about the true God, and still continue to preach about another, are the foes of mankind.' Whereupon I began to understand the Apostle Taylor's parenthesis in the address of the morning. There would be room in the universe for many such gods as that of Brigham Young."↩
3. This section I have taken from Hope's "Compendium," I., 313.—T.↩
4. In a book published in the year of grace 1885, and by no less learned and distinguished a divine than the late Dr. Henry B. Smith, for many years professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, occurs this statement: "Dr. Adam Clarke and *Methodists generally* define omniscience as the power to know all things. *They deny* that God does know all future events, but this is because he does not choose to know. As omnipotence is the power to do all things, so omniscience is the power to know all things, but this does not imply that all things are actually known." (See Dr. Smith's posthumously published "System of Christian Theology," p. 26.) We cannot undertake to read all that Adam Clarke ever wrote in order to prove a universal negative in his case; but for "Methodists generally" we earnestly repudiate the statement, and do not believe there is a respectable theologian among them who teaches any such doctrine. It may be charitably hoped that if Dr. Smith had lived to revise and publish his own MS., this charge would have been eliminated. His editor was certainly lacking either in information or discrimination. —T.↩
5. Eduard Von Hartmann, in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious," in which speculative results are obtained and exhibited according to the inductive methods of the physical sciences, enumerates (Vol. I. pp. 50, 51) no less than thirteen of the "most important" conditions

of vision, as follows:

1. “Special bundles of nerves issue from the brain, which are of such a nature that each stimulus affecting them is perceived in the brain as a sensation of light.
2. “They terminate in a very peculiarly formed, very sensitive nervous tissue (retina).
3. “Before the latter is placed a camera obscura.
4. “The focal distance of this camera is in general adapted to the indices of refraction from air into the ocular humors (except in the case of aquatic animals).
5. “By means of various contractions the focal distance is capable of being changed for long-sighted persons from a few inches to infinity.
6. “The quantity of light to be admitted is regulated by the contraction and dilatation of the iris, whereby an additional aid to clear vision is afforded by the cutting off of the peripheral rays.
7. “The segments of the rods or cones continuous with the nerve-endings form a mosaic, so contrived that each segment changes light waves of definite wave-lengths (color) into stationary waves, and thus produces in the appropriate primitive nerve-fiber the physiological color-vibrations.
8. “Binocular vision conditions the perception of solidity and reveals the third dimension of space.
9. “The two eyes may be simultaneously moved by means of special nerve-bundles and muscles, but only in the same direction, thus unsymmetrically in reference to the muscles.
10. “The clearness of the visual pictures increasing from periphery to center prevents the otherwise unavoidable distraction of the attention.
11. “The reflex turning of the visual axis to the brightest point of the field of vision facilitates education by the medium of sight and the formation of the ideas of space.
12. “The constant flow of tears keeps the surface of the cornea transparent and removes the dust.
13. “The secluded position in the bony socket, the lids which close reflectorially on the approach of danger, the eyelashes and eyebrows, protect the organ from being rendered useless by external influences.

“All these thirteen conditions are necessary for the existence and maintenance of normal vision; they are all there at the birth of the child, although the occasion for their exercise has not yet been afforded; the circumstances preceding and accompanying their origin are accordingly to be sought in procreation and the life of the fetus. The physiologists, however, it may safely be said, will never succeed, with the least show of probability, in exhibiting the sufficient cause for the origin of all these conditions in the blastoderm of the fertilized ovum and the material fluids which supply it: one cannot see why the child should not develop even

without optic nerve or without eye at all. Suppose now, however, that we fell back upon our ignorance, although that is a bad ground for positive probabilities, and assumed a tolerably high probability for the development of any of the thirteen conditions from the material conditions of embryonic life, say 9/10 (a probability which but a small portion of our most certain knowledge possesses), still the probability that all these conditions follow from the material relations of the embryonic life is only $0.9^{13} = 0.254$. The probability, therefore, of a spiritual cause being required for the sum of the conditions = 0.746, *i. e.*, almost 3/4. In truth, however, the several probabilities perhaps = 0.25, or at the most 0.5 [instead of 9/10 as assumed above], and accordingly the probability of a spiritual cause for the whole = 0.9999985 or 0.99988—*i. e.*, certainty."—T.↩

6. Kübel says: "God is the synthesis of all good by virtue of his very being; he is *perfection*, both metaphysical and ethical. The well-known query: Is the good good because God wills it? or does God will it because it is good? is not properly put. The question is not as to God's *willing*, but as to his *essence*. The good is good for the simple reason that it is an outflow, a self-manifestation, of God himself. This answers the question also as to the ground of right. Right is God; a creature does right when it harmonizes with God—that is, when it fulfills the divinely fixed end of its being. The definitions of the divine holiness and righteousness are of the same character. God's holiness is that attribute in virtue of which he takes his own absolutely perfect self as the norm of his entire activity. His holiness as revealed to man, and as revealing to man God's purpose in creating him, is the rule and measure of righteousness. God's self-consistency in his treatment of man, and man's active conformity to God's revealed purpose concerning him, constitute God's and man's righteousness." Dr. Whedon demurs to this, "as making God fatalistically and not freely good." He says: "God is good because, as a free Infinite Person, able to choose either way, he eternally chooses goodness. The perfect excellence of God's physical [!] essence or substance is a natural and not a moral attribute; and it is not until he mounts to will that we are in the region of ethical rectitude." But when "he mounted to will" why did he "choose goodness?" and by what rule was that which he chose goodness, so that he chose that and not its opposite? If he eternally chose goodness, was it not because he was eternally good, as he chooses goodness now because he is good? "Thou art good, and doest good." There may be, as he says, "a poetical and unphilosophical confusion in such phrases as 'God is perfection'—'right (the noun right) is God.'" But they are used in the same way in which the apostle uses

similar expressions—*e. g.*, “God is light,” “God is love.” If we can speak of Godˆs physical nature or essence as comprehending omnipotence, omniscience, and ubiquity, we may surely speak of God’s moral nature, or essence, as comprehending the principles of truth, justice, and benevolence, to which his own will invariably conforms—as he cannot deny himself, cannot act contrary to his nature, as that would involve imperfection—and which are embodied in this legislation, so that his law is holy, just, and good, like himself. T. D. Woolsey, in Johnson’s Cyclopedia, Art. “Liberty,” says: “For an infinite Being, the highest freedom coincides with the highest moral necessity; that is to say, there is one course, and one only, which his perfection of nature requires him to choose, and makes it certain that he will choose.”↩

Chapter III. The Works of God.

I. Creation.

§ 1. Explanatory.

110

The article next proceeds to state that God is "the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible." This point, indeed, is comprehended in the foregoing; but it is proper to insert it in the article as a distinct clause, especially when we note that the word *maker* means *creator*, as in the Latin recension: *Creator et conservator omnium, tum visibilium, tum invisibilium.* He is not merely *the plastic former* of the universe out of pre-existing materials, but he is the originator of the materials themselves.

Imagine a time when there was no matter or spirit—visible or invisible substance—in the universe, and no infinite Being to originate any; then there never could have been any, as out of nothing, nothing comes.

> Thy parent hand, thy forming skill,
> Firm fixed this universal chain;
> Else empty, barren darkness still
> Had held his unmolested reign.

§ 2. Force, Protoplasm, Atoms, Star-dust.

But could not eternal, infinite *force* originate the universe? What is *force?* It is nothing but the attribute or developed energy of a subject. Make it an independent agent, operating with omnific power, and to certain ends, indicating design with esthetic and benevolent (or for that matter malevolent) results, and then it is but another name for God, but far less suitable and suggestive than any of the names by which he has made himself known to us.

But may there not have been eternal *protoplasms* and *life-cells*, out of which, during the past eternity, ascidians may have been

evolved, and then by successive evolutions and transmutations, natural selection with “the survival of the fittest” and the destruction

of the rest, all other animals, including the *anthropoids* and *anthrops*, may have been produced? Well, no; there would have been no such thing, and it is absurd to broach an hypothesis so irrational and baseless. Such a genesis would involve a power and skill which bespeak a personal agent and a designing mind—and that is what we call God. This absurd hypothesis not only finds no warrant, but flat contradiction, in Scripture, and it has nothing to support it in nature or history; the records of men, the older records of the geologic ages, give not the slightest intimation of any such cosmogony as this.

For similar reasons the universe could not have originated, without divine intervention, from atoms, monads, fire-mists, star-dust, nebulae, and the like. Could such things originate themselves? and, supposing they were eternal, could they originate motion? could they direct their own motions? unite and form the millions of objects in nature which are so exquisitely proportioned and adapted to so varied and wonderful uses? evolve life, vegetable, animal, intellectual, moral? all this by blind chance? by a fortuitous concourse of those marvelous atoms, every one of which must have been a *godling* to produce such stupendous results? It is astounding that a scientist of the nineteenth Christian age should revive such effete absurdities, and substitute them for the sublime, rational, and divinely revealed cosmogony, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”

The word *creator* in this clause of the article means originator as well as former. God made the substance of the universe out of nothing, as has been already shown, and then formed it into all the shapes we see around us; upon every part of which we behold inscribed “*Deus fecit*"—"he that built all things is God.”

§ 3. Invisible Things.

By invisible things are meant spiritual substances, whether embodied, like the souls of men, or unembodied, as angels or other incorporeal beings of whom we have no knowledge. In this category

are not included the *spiritss* of beasts, as they are called; for although in addition to the organization of brutes there is animal life, with sensation and instinct, and faint shadows of intellect, sensibility, and will, yet we cannot attribute to them reason and conscience, immateriality and immortality.

112

Let the beasts their breath resign,
Strangers to the life divine;
Who their God can never know,
Let their spirits downward go.

It is useless, and would be here out of place, to enter into the speculations and logomachies of Taylor, Darwin, and others on this subject, which does not lie open to human ken, and has not been made a point of divine revelation. But if any choose to elevate the animal life into a spiritual and immortal essence, let them do so, only it must be borne in mind that all the inferior animated creation, howsoever constituted, was made by God, and marvelously displays his glorious perfections. “But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” (Job xxxii. 8.) “Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” (Matt. x. 28.) His spiritual nature was infused into the bodily organization of man at his creation by God (Gen. ii. 7), and it is imparted to every descendant of Adam and Eve by procreation; and is separated from the body at death, when it returns to God who gave it (Eccl. xii. 7).

We can form no conception of a spiritual essence, except by its properties. We cannot assign to it the properties of matter, length, breadth, thickness, density, etc., as we cannot attribute to matter those which we are conscious belong to spirit: it has intellect, will, and sensibility; it has the power of acting on matter and of being acted on by it; it is mysteriously united with the body, and while thus united is dependent upon it for all its knowledge of the external world, yet can live separated from it, as do disembodied spirits in the intermediate state. It was made in the image of God, in respect to *spirituality, intellectuality, moral character*, and *immortality*. “Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor; thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things

under his feet." (Ps. viii. 5, 6.)

§ 4. The Angels.

As to the angels, they are pure spirits, and as such, of course, they are invisible to mortals. They are indeed spoken of in the Scripture—the only source of information concerning them—as making themselves visible to men; but that is either subjectively,

to the mind, as in "a vision," or if objectively, by the temporary assumption of a tangible, visible vehicle, altogether miraculous in its phenomenal character. These spirits, of every rank, were created by God, who made all things by Jesus Christ: "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." (Col. i. 16, 17.)

When the angels and other superhuman intelligences were created, the Scriptures do not inform us. We know it was before men were created, and before the visible universe was called into being. Thus God answered Job: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? . . . when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?" (Job xxxviii. 4–7.) Indeed some of them "which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (Jude 6), were ready to tempt man to his ruin as soon as he was created.

§ 5. The Mosaic Cosmogony.

When and how man was created and the visible universe was brought into existence, God has not been pleased to reveal—except that about six thousand years ago "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. ii. 7.) Whatever hypothesis may be adopted as to the time and manner of the genesis of the universe, it still remains that God created it. Only hypothetical interpretations of the Mosaic cosmogony can be given.

1. Some hold that it is a *myth*—no real history. But this opinion

is inconsistent with a belief in the divine authority of Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, as they all cite it familiarly and constantly as a veritable historic record. Indeed, the traditions derived from it spread over the world—Ovid's Metamorphoses, for example, being a kind of poetical recension of the Mosaic account of creation, adapted to heathen mythology.

Before the seas and this terrestrial ball,
And heaven's high canopy that covers all,
One was the face of nature—if a face;
Rather, a rude and indigested mass;

114

A lifeless lump, unfashioned and unformed
Of jarring seeds, and justly chaos named.
But God or nature, while they thus contend,
To these intestine discords put an end;
Then earth from air, and seas from earth were driven.
And grosser air sunk from ethereal heaven.

2. Others say it is a kind of *poem* of creation, which may be adapted to any facts which may be developed by science and philosophy. This is vague and unintelligible.

3. Others speak of it as having *no reference to time*, but merely to order—not to specific miraculous acts, but to natural processes, evolved during the interminable cycles of the past, so that the whole universe of inanimate, irrational, and rational beings may have been developed by successive stages, called "days" by Moses, from infinitesimal monads or atoms. This evolutionary notion is gratuitous. Attention has been already given it—not less, perhaps more, than it deserves.

4. Others contend that *all the visible creation was originated* about six thousand years ago—"in the beginning"—and in the order set down by Moses, literally interpreted. The objections drawn from fossiliferous strata and the like are met by reference to the analogy of Adam and Eve, who presented the phenomena of adults when they were but a day old; and by the flood of Noah and other cataclysms, which, with the constant changes of nature, are sufficient to account for the phenomena in question.

5. Others again maintain that *the first verse of Genesis is to be discerped from the demiurgic account which follows*, and that it may date back as many millions of ages as geology requires for all the

phenomena developed by its researches. Thus the subsequent account refers exclusively to the present *cosmos*, other *cosmoi* having preceded it. Moses has nothing to say about what took place before the human period, except that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The connective particle rendered "And" may be rendered "Now," being transitional to the history of the six demiurgic days. "Now the earth was without form and void"—that is, the *cosmos*, which preceded the present—as was the case with others before—was thrown into a chaos, out of which this present *cosmos* was miraculously formed by God in six successive natural days. It cannot be supposed that all the fossils were created as such—all must admit that they were once living vegetals and animals; nor can it be

115

thought that they were produced, in the order in which we find them, in two or three days. This hypothesis, it is thought, reconciles Genesis and geology, without doing violence to either; and it has this to recommend it, that some of the Fathers and the Reformers, who knew nothing of geology, and had no special end to serve, separated the first verse from the succeeding verses in Genesis i. But it is not material what hypothesis is adopted, provided the Holy Scriptures be not contradicted and God be not banished from the universe as its Creator and Conservator.[1]

II. Preservation.

§ 1. Divine Providence.

The article asserts that God is the preserver of all things, both visible and invisible.

As *conservator* of all things, God is recognized as maintaining the universe in that state and order which is agreeable to his own designs. This superintendence of creation is commonly called divine providence. The word[2] is never used in Scripture except once, when it refers to something else (Acts xxiv. 2); but that which it imports is abundantly inculcated.

[The term providence, in its widest meaning, signifies the divine presence in the world as sustaining, controlling, and guiding to their

destination all things that are made. The *will of God determines the end* for which all orders of creaturely being exist. *His wisdom and his goodness appoint the infinite variety of means* by which that one end is attained: in the *conservation of the frame of nature*, both spiritual and material; in the care of all creatures that are the subjects of want; in the *government especially of intelligent and probationary beings.* And his *power insures the accomplishment of every design or end* for which they exist. The doctrine of providence may be studied, therefore, in its connection with the Divine Being and the

divine attributes; then in relation to the objects and characteristics of its exercise.[3]]

We need go no further than the proof-texts contained in the Catechism, where God's providence is well defined as "His most holy, wise, and powerful preservation and government of all his creatures and all their actions." "He upholdeth all things by the word of his power." (Heb. i. 3.) "In him we live, and move, and have our being." (Acts xvii. 28.) "He satisfieth the desire of every living thing." (Ps. cxlv. 15, 16.) "His kingdom ruleth over all." (Ps. ciii. 19.) "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." (Matt. x. 30.) "King of kings, and Lord of Lords." (1 Tim. vi. 15.) "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." (Ps. lxxvi. 10.) [Providence, therefore, both in the definition and in the proof-texts (and in the Scriptures generally), presents itself as embracing the two great departments: (1) Conservation, and (2) Government.]

§ 2. Division of the Doctrine.

Providence has been arranged under eight heads:

1. *Immediate*—that which is exercised by God himself, without the intervention of any instrument or second cause;
2. *Mediate*—that which is exercised in the use of means;
3. *Ordinary*—that which is exercised in the common course of events and by second causes;
4. *Extraordinary*—out of the common order, as miracles;
5. *Common*—what belongs to the world at large;
6. *Special*—what relates to the Church;
7. *Universal*—what relates to the general upholding of all things;
8. *Particular*—what relates to individuals in every circumstance

of life.

These distinctions are not altogether logical. They run into each other—for example, a special providence is the same as a particular providence, that care which is directed to a special or particular object. Further, particular providences are all comprehended in the universal, or general, providence by which God superintends the universe.[4] Thus John Wesley argues, in his Sermon on Providence:

You say you allow a *general* providence, but deny a *particular* one. And what is a general, of whatever kind it be, that includes no particulars? Is not every general necessarily made up of its several particulars? Can you instance me any general that is not? Tell me any genus, if you can, that contains no species? What is it that constitutes a genus, but so many species added together? What, I pray, is a whole that contains no parts? Mere nonsense and contradiction. Every whole must, in the nature of things, be made up of its several parts; insomuch that if there be no parts, there can be no whole.

§ 3. Pope's "Universal Prayer."

The providential government of God is modified according to its subjects. This is hinted by Pope in his "Universal Prayer," which he wrote as an offset to the *quasi* fatalism and pantheism contained in his "Essay on Man," according to the note prefixed to the Prayer:

It may be proper to observe that some passages in the preceding essay having been unjustly suspected of a tendency toward fate and naturalism, the author composed this prayer as the sum of all, to show that this system was founded in free will, and terminated in piety; that the First Cause was as well the Lord and Governor of the universe as the Creator of it; and that by submission to his will (the great principle enforced through the essay) was not meant the suffering ourselves to be carried along by a blind determination, but a resting in a religious acquiescence, and confidence full of hope and immortality. To give all this the greater weight, the poet chose for his model the Lord's Prayer, which, of all others, best deserves the title prefixed to this paraphrase.

It is to be feared that this apology will not save the "Essay" from the charge in question; but the "Universal Prayer," bating an ambiguous expression or two, does contain just sentiments

concerning divine providence; distinguishing between the government of moral subjects and of the irrational and inanimate, and recognizing a special as well as a general superintendence.

Father of all! in every age.
In every clime adored.
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!

118
Thou great First Cause, least understood,
Who all my sense confined
To know but this, that thou art good,
And that myself am blind;

Yet gave me in this dark estate
To see the good from ill;
And, binding nature fast in fate,
Left free the human will.[5]

§ 4. The Reign of Law.

By certain laws of attraction and repulsion, God governs the entire universe of matter which has no life of any sort. As far as science has gone with its explorations, the reign of law has been discovered; and the operation thereof is uniform and certain, so that the most important interests and issues are based upon its action. The sixty-five elements of which the world is constituted possess certain inalienable properties, and sustain fixed relations to one another wherever they are found. No matter where oxygen and hydrogen in certain proportions are chemically combined (viz., one part hydrogen and eight parts oxygen) water is invariably produced; whenever oxygen and nitrogen, in certain proportions, are mechanically interfused (not chemically combined) atmospheric air is the certain product. Precise laws of this sort govern every thing in nature from the atom to the most ponderous orb.

§ 5. Vital Forces.

Superadded to these laws are certain life-forces as vitalizing

influences, vegetal and animal, which produce the phenomena of life. There is a vast difference between animals and vegetals, as there is a vast difference between vegetals and minerals; yet as there seems to be a kind of connecting link between the latter, so there is between the former—zoophytes, though real animals, having somewhat the appearance of vegetals. But the *differentia* is as fixed and insurmountable in the one case as in the other. No science or art can superadd the mysterious principles of vegetal life to any combination of the sixty-five elements to make a plant; nor the still more marvelous principle of animal life to make an animal. God has made these what they are, and fixed the bounds which they cannot pass. By fixed natural laws, and

by the interposition of rational beings, they may be endlessly modified as to varieties of the same species, but the species suffer no transmutation. The same Power that created them preserves them in being; and so, according to the primordial law, every thing that moveth in air, earth, or water, as well as every plant that grows, brings forth produce "after its kind." There is no *abiogenesis*, as some talk—life produced from dead protoplasm; nor *hetero biogenesis*—life of one species evolved from life of another. To produce a plant there must be a seed or germ of the same species, submitted to the conditions of vegetal development belonging to every distinct species. So of animals, from the invisible animalcule to the mastodon or whale, like produces like in every instance. As men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, so the ascidian never evolves an anthropoid, mediately or immediately, nor the anthropoid an anthrop. Varieties there are without number, and hybrids within a limited range, but while the former are fertile the latter are sterile, and there will be no generation or race of fertile hybrids to the end of time.

§ 6. God's Government of the Inanimate and Irrational.

All these subjects of God's universal government are upheld and governed by laws adapted to their nature, and of which they are ignorant. They are bound fast in fate. Vegetals have the semblance of sensation and instinct, but they have neither; animals that have both seem to possess intellect, sensibility, and will, but

they have only typical resemblances of these attributes of a higher nature. Hence they are brought into existence without any procreating design on the part of their parents; they are endowed with the properties which belong to their respective species, and to which they are bound “fast in fate”—that is, forced to act according to sensation and instinct; they are made inservient to the universe of which they form a part; they know nothing of their origin, nature, or destiny; they are not accountable for their acts, which have no moral character, as they have no moral sense; and at death they perish, so that they have no *post-mortem* state of existence.

§ 7. The Moral Government of God.

Superadded to the laws which govern the inanimate and the irrational subjects of God’s providential care are intellectual and

moral principles in the case of men and angels, or other intelligences that possess intellect, will, and sensibilities. These higher principles subordinate the inferior, and so fully and obviously do they subordinate them, that God’s government of these higher beings is called emphatically his moral government. And here the divine attributes are displayed in all their greatness and glory. By his procuring, or permissive, or controlling providence, or by all united, he governs every thought, word, and deed of every man and angel, or other intelligence, in the universe. He makes known his mind and will to them; commands them to obey it; furnishes them all the necessary means to do so; moves them by sanctions, as promises of reward in case of obedience and threatenings of punishment in case of disobedience—in short, governs them as free, moral, accountable, immortal beings, as they are, and not as necessary, unaccountable beings, which they are not.

If individuals of one class—angels—sin, and their sin affects only themselves, they are left to the consequences of their own folly and crime—a warning to the universe. If the progenitors of another class—human beings—sin, and their sin, in view of the solidarity of the species, affects their posterity, the highest exercise of power and wisdom and goodness is put forth by God for the redemption of the sinning men, and for the wonderful contrivance by which

redemption is made ultimately available to their salvation. Every thing in the universe is made subservient to this great end. “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God.” (Rom. viii. 28.) Thus the sovereignty of God remains intact; intact also remains the freedom of his subjects. It was this which elicited that sublime outburst of the apostle: “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him aud through him and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen.” (Rom. xi. 33–36.)

§ 8. Summary.

[A few general observations are still necessary to complete this view of providence. It is obviously the most comprehensive term in the language of theology: the background, mysterious in its brightness or darkness, of all the several departments

of religious truth. Rather, it penetrates and fills the whole compass of the relations of man with his Maker. It connects the Unseen God with the visible creation, and the visible creation with the work of redemption, and redemption with personal salvation, and personal salvation with the end of all things. There is no topic which has already been discussed, none which awaits discussion, that does not pay its tribute to the all-embracing, all-surrounding doctrine of providence. The word itself—let it be once more impressed—in one aspect of it carries our thoughts up to that *supreme purpose* which was in the beginning with God, and in another carries our thoughts down to the *foreseen end* or consummation of all things; while it includes between these the whole infinite variety of the dealings of God with man. It silently accompanies theology, therefore, into all its regions of study and meditation; touches it literally at every point, and sheds its glory, oppressive to reason but invigorating to faith, over all branches of its investigation. It ought to be the grand *reconciler* of the contending advocates of predestination and conditional election. The former claim and must have all the legitimate rights of the πρόθεσις [predestination]; the latter should not be defrauded of the rights of the πρόγνωσις [foreknowledge]; while both must rejoice in the πρόνοια [providence] that comes between. All theological truths are rounded by this unfathomable word. But for the very reason that it is, in its widest compass, so literally

boundless and universal, we find it necessary to give it only a scanty treatment as one distinct department.[6]]

---

1. In a note to a passage in Watson's "Institutes" (Part I. Chapter 20), where Mr. Watson enters a caveat in regard to the last hypothesis, we say: "Among the authorities claimed for this view are Justin Martyr, Origen, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustin, and Theodoret. By referring the beginning to a period remotely anterior to the first demiurgic day, they afford a margin large enough for all the time demanded by geologists for the changes which have taken place in the crust of the earth, Luther, Calvin, Episcopius, Bishop Patrick, and an increasing number of modern divines, think the six days' work begins at the third verse of Genesis i. Others still contend for the interpretation defended by the author."↩
2. The word providence (Latin, *providentia*, Greek, πρόνοια) does not occur in the Scriptures, except, as noted above, in the rhetorical allusion of Tertullus to the government of Felix, in the opening of his speech before that Roman governor. It occurs twice in the apocryphal book of Wisdom, xiv. 3 and xvii. 2. *Providere* and πρόνοεῖν mean not only to *foresee*, but *to plan beforehand*, to *forecast*, to *provide*, to *take precautionary measures*. In this sense *providere* is used by Cicero (De. Nat. Deor. ii. 65): *Non universo generi hominum solum, sed etiam singulis a deis consuli et provideri solet*—a passage which clearly sets forth the doctrine of an individual providence.—T.↩
3. This compendious, analytic definition is Pope's ("Compendium," I. 437), and admirably coalesces with Dr. Summers's treatment.—T.↩
4. The preceding assertions of the text are not altogether clear. It is true that "Special" and "Particular," as ordinarily employed, are synonyms; but by definition "Special" providence is confined to the Church as a society, while "Particular" providence concerns individuals, and these irrespectively of their Christian character. It must be admitted, too, that as the terms are usually understood "Universal" providence would certainly include all "Particular" providences under it, and that a general providence without particular providences is an absurdity, as Mr. Wesley argues in the passage quoted, yet the definitions of the text certainly discriminate between the two with sufficient clearness. It is more difficult to see any distinction in the definitions of the text, between the "Immediate" and the "Extraordinary," and between the "Mediate" and the "Ordinary:" here Dr. Summers's charge of illogical cross-division appears to hold good.—T.↩

5. Dr. Summers, in his MS., noted simply the first line of the first stanza, as he was able to repeat the poem from memory when lecturing. I have quoted the stanzas most relevant.—T.↩
6. Pope, “Compendium” I. 456.↩

Chapter IV. Theodicy: The Divine Glory Vindicated.

§ 1. Antitheistic Evolution: Force.

122

The doctrine concerning the being, attributes, and works of God, set forth in this article, is in direct antagonism to atheism, pantheism, polytheism, tritheism, dualism, and naturalism, in all its infidel forms, as has been already noticed. But there are certain antitheistic objections which demand a specific notice.

It is argued that there is no necessity for a Being of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, as all the phenomena of the universe can be accounted for by force, operating upon protoplasm, or the monads, atoms, or molecules which have existed from eternity—by evolution, natural selection, transmutation of species, and survival of the fittest.

Now we have already shown that there could have been no monads or protoplasms, or aught else, without a creator, and there could have been no adaptations or natural selections—or indeed evolution of any sort—without a designing mind; and there can be no force without a subject in which it exists, as well as an object upon which it is exerted. Force is not an agent—it is only the energy put forth by an agent. It is the predicate of a subject, not the subject itself. Force capable of producing the phenomena of the universe, and developing them in all their infinite varieties and forms of utility and beauty, with their manifold harmonies, designs, and ends—preserving each species intact, and never fainting or growing weary through the lapse of ages—that is but another name for God. It is not an attribute but a subject—and such a subject as has predicated of it the attributes of power and wisdom and goodness. But what is gained by substituting for the scriptural names of the Supreme Being such names as force, or stream, or tendency, or nature, or fate, or any other term which antitheists, ancient or modern, may invent? The infinite Being in whom this wonderful force inheres is the *Elohim*, the *Jehovah, El Shaddai, Adonai*—the *I am*,

123

the Self-existent, the All-sufficient, the universal Lord of the Holy Scriptures.[1] If other titles are wanted, significant and suggestive ones are found in the Bible, so that there is no necessity of coining new ones, especially such as inadequately set forth his eternal power and Godhead.

There is not the slightest hint of evolution and its concomitants in nature or revelation; but if there were, that would not supersede the being and perfections and works of God. No matter when or how creation began, God alone was adequate to the task. No matter how it is upheld in existence, whether mediately or immediately, God upholds all things by the word of his power, as it requires the exercise of the same attributes which called a world from naught to keep it still in being. "My Father worketh hitherto," says Christ, "and I work." Conservation is but a continuous plastic creation. Thus the inspired philosopher speaks of the creatures which the Lord has made "in wisdom:" "These wait all upon thee; that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. That thou givest them they gather: thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth.

The glory of the Lord shall endure forever: the Lord shall rejoice in his works." (Ps. civ. 27–31.)

In earth, in heaven, in all thou art;
The conscious creature feels thy nod;
Thy forming hand on every part
Impressed the image of its God.
To thy benign, indulgent care,
Father, this light, this breath, we owe;
And all we have, and all we are,
From thee, great Source of being, flow.

§ 2. Power, Wisdom, Goodness, Impugned.

But it is objected that if the argument from design be admitted it follows from the manifold imperfections and evils—physical and moral—in the world that there are more gods than one, if there be

any; or if there be but one, that he is defective in power and wisdom, or in goodness, or in all these.

Now this objection is answered, first, by concession. There are physical and moral evils in the universe. The world—man himself—is marked by imperfections. The author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" in his supplementary chapter, fully concedes this.2

The Christian apologist—*e. g.*, Bishop Butler, in his "Analogy"—finds little difficulty in the controversy with deists, who believe in the one living and true God, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness. Creator of all things, visible and invisible; but in the controversy with antitheists, deists find it a paradox which proves too hard for them. It has never been finally disposed of in systems of natural theology.

§ 3. Cudworth's "Plastic Nature."

Dr. Cudworth, in his "Intellectual System of the Universe"—a work of prodigious learning, and one, too, which demolishes atheism, though short-sighted persons attributed atheism to the author for writing it—attempts to reduce the paradox by his strange figment of Plastic Nature. This is a *nondescript*—a *tertium quid*—an entity which mediates between God and nature. To *him*, *her*, or *it* is delegated by God the work of carrying on all the operations of nature. Matter can do nothing of itself—procreation, reproduction, is as impossible to matter as

its original creation—but Plastic Nature, though blind and deaf and dumb and impersonal, can do it, because so ordered by God; it does it however imperfectly, with many mistakes and imperfections, because it is not God, but Plastic Nature! To state this absurd figment is to refute it; and it need not be stated, except to show that the greatest and best minds have felt the difficulty in question, and have betrayed an incredible weakness in their attempts to solve it. But there is no necessity for any subterfuge. The Christian theist can walk up boldly to it, and fear no evil.

§ 4. An *A Priori* Answer: God's Power.

There is an *a priori* consideration which may be used in opposing this atheistic or dualistic objection, with great pertinency and good results. The display of power, wisdom, and goodness in the works of creation warrants the belief that, as the Bible says, the Creator and Conservator of the Universe possesses these attributes in an infinite degree. When we survey the heavens, the works of God's fingers, the moon and the stars which he has ordained, and the millions of worlds and systems of worlds, "with all which them inherit," we are so impressed with the exhibition of power that we instinctively, intuitively infer that he who made all these ponderous orbs and keeps them in mighty motion could make as many more as he pleased; that "He who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance—who taketh up the isles as a very little thing—that the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary." Surely nothing is too hard for the Lord. If there be, therefore, any evils in the universe, physical or moral, which omnipotence could have prevented or remedied, it cannot be inferred from their existence that he could not have prevented or remedied those evils. It was very natural for Job to exclaim, after witnessing the exhibition of God's power in the phenomena of nature: "I know that thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee." (Job xlii. 2.)

§ 5. The Divine Wisdom.

By parity the argument applies to the wisdom of God. Admit

that God searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men; that he knows all about every thing that he has made; that he has adjusted all the parts of every object in nature to make it what it is, and adapted it to its place in creation, so as to conserve the *cosmos* which he has created; that he governs his creatures by laws adapted to their character, as necessary or as moral agents; and we instinctively, intuitively conclude that "there is no searching of his understanding," that he is the only wise God, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and we exclaim with

adoring wonder: “Lord, thou knowest all things!”

Infinite strength and equal skill
Shine through thy works abroad;
Our souls with vast amazement fill,
And speak the builder God!

If, therefore, there be any imperfection in the scheme of nature and of providence, it cannot be attributed to lack of wisdom on the part of God, for he certainly knows what are the best ends and what ars the best means to secure them.

§ 6. The Divine Goodness.

But does the argument apply in the same way to the goodness of God? It would seem that it does. By goodness, it must be remembered, is here meant not merely benevolence, but *bonitas*, essential and relative goodness, comprehending all God’s moral perfections—his holiness, subjectively considered, essential moral rectitude, and his relative attributes of truth, justice, and benevolence.

The volume of nature can give us but inadequate conceptions of the goodness of God, and the dispensations of providence, as limited to the present state, supply but a *modicum* of additional information. But when we look into the final causes of creation and providence, we see so many evidences of truth, justice, and benevolence that we instinctively and intuitively conclude that he is, what the name of God imports, “the good Being.” In millions of instances open to our mind, and apprehensible to our intellect, we discover goodness as the end of his operations, so that, practically, we do depend upon the truth and justice and benevolence of the Creator and Conservator of the world—all, good and bad, do confide in his moral perfections.

127

All things in thee live, move, and are;
Thy power infused doth all sustain;
E’en those thy daily favors share
Who, thankless, spurn thy easy reign.

Thy sun thou bidd’st his genial ray

Alike on all impartial pour;
On all who hate or bless thy sway
Thou bidd'st descend the fruitful shower.

§ 7. Paley's Teleological Exhibition of the Divine Goodness.

The teleological argument, as applied to the goodness of God, particularly his benevolence, is thus beautifully and pregnantly presented by Dr. Paley in his "Natural Theology":

In a vast plurality of instances in which contrivance is perceived, the design of the contrivance is *beneficial*.

No productions of nature display contrivance so manifestly as the parts of animals; and the parts of animals have all of them, I believe, a real, and, with very few exceptions, all of them a known and intelligible, subserviency to the use of the animal. Now, when the multitude of animals is considered, the number of parts in each, their figure and fitness, the faculties depending upon them, the variety of species, the complexity of structure, the success, in so many cases, and felicity of the result, we can never reflect, without the profoundest adoration, upon the character of that Being from whom all these things have proceeded: we cannot help acknowledging what an exertion of benevolence creation was; of a benevolence how minute in its care, how vast in its comprehension!

When we appeal to the parts and faculties of animals, and to the limbs and senses of animals in particular, we state, I conceive, the proper medium of proof for the conclusion which we wish to establish. I will not say that the insensible parts of nature are made solely for the sensitive parts; but this I say, that, when we consider the benevolence of the Deity, we can only consider it in relation to sensitive being. Without this reference, or referred to any thing else, the attribute has no object, the term has no meaning. Dead matter is nothing. The parts, therefore, especially the limbs and senses, of animals, although they constitute, in mass and quantity, a small portion of the material creation, yet, since they alone are instruments of perception, they compose what may be called the whole of visible nature, estimated with a view to the disposition of its Author. Consequently, it is in *these* that we are to seek his character. It is by these that we are to prove that the world was made with a benevolent design.

Nor is the design abortive. It is a happy world after all. The air, the earth, the water, teem with delighted existence. In a spring noon, or a summer evening, on whichever side I turn my eyes, myriads of happy beings crowd upon my view. "The insect youth are on the wing." Swarms of newborn *flies* are trying their pinions in the air. Their sportive motions, their wanton mazes, their gratuitous activity, their continual change of

place without use or purpose, testify their joy, and the exultation which they feel in their lately discovered faculties. A *bee* amongst the flowers in spring is one of the most cheerful objects that can be looked upon. Its life appears to be all enjoyment; so busy, and so pleased; yet it is only a specimen

of insect life with which, by reason of the animal being half domesticated, we happen to be better acquainted than we are with that of others. The *whole winged* insect tribe, it is probable, are equally intent upon their proper employments, and, under every variety of constitution, gratified, and perhaps equally gratified, by the offices which the Author of their nature has assigned to them. But the atmosphere is not the only scene of enjoyment for the insect race. Plants are covered with *aphides*, greedily sucking their juices, and constantly, as it should seem, in the act of sucking. It cannot be doubted but that this is a state of gratification. What else should fix them so close to the operation, and so long? Other species are *running about*, with an alacrity in their motions which carries with it every mark of pleasure. Large patches of ground are sometimes half covered with these brisk and sprightly natures. If we look to what the *waters* produce, shoals of the fry of fish frequent the margins of rivers, of lakes, and of the sea itself. These are so happy that they know not what to do with themselves. Their attitudes, their vivacity, their leaps out of the water, their frolics in it (which I have noticed a thousand times with equal attention and amusement), all conduce to show their excess of spirits, and are simply the effects of that excess. Walking by the sea-side in a calm evening, upon a sandy shore, and with an ebbing tide, I have frequently remarked the appearance of a dark cloud, or rather very thick mist, hanging over the edge of the water, to the height, perhaps, of half a yard, and of the breadth of two or three yards, stretching along the coast as far as the eye could reach, and always retiring with the water. When this cloud came to be examined, it proved to be nothing else than so much space filled with young *shrimps*, in the act of bounding into the air from the shallow margin of the water, or from the wet sand. If any motion of a mute animal could express delight, it was this: if they had meant to make signs of their happiness, they could not have done it more intelligibly. Suppose then, what I have no doubt of, each individual of this number to be in a state of positive enjoyment, what a sum, collectively, of gratification and pleasure have we here before our view!

Animal enjoyments are infinitely *diversified*. The modes of life to which the organization of different animals respectively determines them are not only of various, but opposite, kinds. Yet each is happy in its own. For instance: animals of prey live much alone; animals of a milder constitution, in society. Yet the herring, which lives in shoals, and the sheep, which lives in flocks, are not more happy in a crowd, or more contented amongst their

companions, than is the pike or the lion with the deep solitudes of the pool or the forest.

But it will be said that the instances which we have here brought forward, whether of vivacity or repose, or of apparent enjoyment derived from either, are picked and favorable instances. We answer, first, that they are instances, nevertheless, which comprise large provinces of sensitive existence; that every case which we have described is the case of millions. At this moment, in every given moment of time, how many myriads of animals are eating their food, gratifying their appetites, ruminating in their holes, accomplishing their wishes, pursuing their pleasures, taking their pastimes? In each individual, how many things must go right for it to be at ease; yet how large a proportion out of every species is so in every assignable instant! Secondly, we contend in the terms of our original proposition that throughout the whole of life, as it is diffused in nature, and as far as we are acquainted with it, looking to the average of sensations, the plurality and

the preponderancy is in favor of happiness by a vast excess. In our own species, in which perhaps the assertion may be more questionable than in any other, the prepollency of good over evil—of health, for example, and ease over pain and distress—is evinced by the very notice which calamities excite. What inquiries does the sickness of our friends produce! what conversation their misfortunes! This shows that the common course of things is in favor of happiness; that happiness is the rule, misery the exception. Were the order reversed, our attention would be called to examples of health and competency, instead of disease and want.

One great cause of our insensibility to the goodness of the Creator is the very *extensiveness* of his bounty. We prize but little what we share only in common with the rest, or with the generality of our species. When Ave hear of blessings, we think forthwith of successes, of prosperous fortunes, of honors, riches, preferments—*i. e.*, of those advantages and superiorities over others which we happen either to possess or to be in pursuit of or to covet. The common benefits of our nature entirely escape us. Yet these are the great things. These constitute what most properly ought to be accounted blessings of providence—what alone, if we might so speak, are worthy of its care. Nightly rest and daily bread, the ordinary use of our limbs and senses and understandings, are gifts which admit of no comparison with any other. Yet, because almost every man we meet with possesses these, we leave them out of our enumeration. They raise no sentiment; they move no gratitude. Now herein is our judgment perverted by our selfishness. A blessing ought in truth to be the *more* satisfactory, the bounty at least of the donor is rendered more conspicuous, by its very diffusion, its commonness, its cheapness; by its falling to the lot, and forming the happiness of the great bulk and body of our species, as well as

of ourselves. Nay, even when we do not possess it, it ought to be matter of thankfulness that others do. But we have a different way of thinking. We court distinction. That is not the worst; we see nothing but what has distinction to recommend it. This necessarily contracts our views of the Creator's beneficence within a narrow compass; and most unjustly. It is in those things which are so common as to be no distinction that the amplitude of the divine benignity is perceived.

But pain, no doubt, and privations exist in numerous instances, and to a degree which, collectively, would be very great, if they were compared with any other thing than with the mass of animal fruition. For the application, therefore, of our proposition to that *mixed* state of things which these exceptions induce, two rules are necessary, and both, I think, just and fair rules. One is, that we regard those effects alone which are accompanied with proofs of intention; the other, that when we cannot resolve all appearances into benevolence of design, we make the few give place to the many, the little to the great; that we take our judgment from a large and decided preponderancy, if there be one.

I crave leave to transcribe into this place what I have said upon this subject in my "Moral Philosophy:" "When God created the human species, either he wished their happiness or he wished their misery, or he was indifferent and unconcerned about either. If he had wished our misery, he might have made sure of his purpose by forming our senses to be so many sores and pains to us as they are now instruments of gratification and enjoyment; or by placing us amidst objects so ill suited to our perceptions as to have continually offended us, instead of ministering to our refreshment and delight. He might have made, for example, every

thing we tasted bitter, every thing we saw loathsome, every thing we touched a sting, every smell a stench, and every sound a discord. If he had been indifferent about our happiness or misery, we must impute to our good fortune (as all design by this supposition is excluded) both the capacity of our senses to receive pleasure and the supply of external objects fitted to produce it. But either of these, and still more both of them, being too much to be attributed to accident, nothing remains but the first supposition, that God, when he created the human species, wished their happiness, and made for them the provision which he has made, with that view and for that purpose. The same argument may be proposed in different terms, *thus*: Contrivance proves design, and the predominant tendency of the contrivance indicates the disposition of the designer. The world abounds with contrivances; and all the contrivances which we are acquainted with are directed to beneficial purposes. Evil, no doubt, exists; but is never, that we can perceive, the *object* of contrivance. Teeth are contrived to eat, not to ache; their aching now and then is incidental to the contrivance, perhaps inseparable from it; or even, if you will, let it be

called a defect in the contrivance; but it is not the object of it. This is a distinction which well deserves to be attended to. In describing implements of husbandry, you would hardly say of the sickle that it is made to cut the reaper's band; though, from the construction of the instrument and the manner of using it, this mischief often follows. But if you had occasion to describe instruments of torture or execution, this engine, you would say, is to extend the sinews, this to dislocate the joints, this to break the bones; this to scorch the soles of the feet. Here, pain and misery are the very objects of the contrivance. Now nothing of this sort is to be found in the works of nature. We never discover a train of contrivance to bring about an evil purpose. No anatomist ever discovered a system of organization calculated to produce pain and disease; or, in explaining the parts of the human body, ever said, this is to irritate; this to inflame; this duct is to convey the gravel to the kidneys; this gland to secrete the humor which forms the gout; if by chance he come at a part of which he knows not the use, the most he can say is, that it is useless; no one ever suspects that it is put there to incommode, to annoy, or to torment."[3]

Assuming that God is the great Contriver, one cannot help exclaiming with the Psalmist, "Thou art good and doest good." And as it is done on so large a scale, and as the streams of divine beneficence "the whole creation reach," how natural, how irresistible the inference that they flow from an infinite, inexhaustible source in the bosom of the Deity,

That sea of life and love unknown.
Without a bottom or a shore!

We feel that God must be *light*—that is, moral goodness—and that in him there is no *darkness* at all, no moral pravity of any

kind or any degree. This *a priori* argument does not indeed demonstrate the infinitude of those perfections which are displayed in nature and providence; but it furnishes a strong presumption in favor of it, and constitutes a powerful corroboration of its truth as otherwise established.

§ 8. Mr. J. S. Mill's Manicheism Considered.

When, then, John Stuart Mill points to certain phenomena in nature which are considered evils, and attempts to show that they are the results of laws established for those very ends, and

impiously infers that if there be but one God he must be defective in power or wisdom or goodness, or in all these—indeed, that he must be very powerful, and very wise, and very good, and, at the same time, very weak, very foolish, and very bad—he only demonstrates that, though the reputed master of logic, his reasoning is very weak, very foolish, and very bad, without one redeeming feature in it of power or wisdom or goodness. "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" (James iii. 11.) "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble-bush gather they grapes." (Luke vi. 43, 41.) We do not object to the test of teleology in this case. There are in nature final causes, having reference to physical evils, as they are called. This has been already conceded—nay, it is insisted upon, with great emphasis—as necessary to justify the ways of God to men. Such telic facts are indispensable to the proof of the power and wisdom and goodness of God in the government of the world. Every theodicy worth the name recognizes and demands them. "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things." (Isa. xlv. 7.) "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" (Amos iii. 6.) By "darkness" and "evil" in these places, as elsewhere shown, Jehovah does not mean moral evil, but the punishment of it, physical or natural evil; not sin, but retribution for sin; and is this inconsistent with power, wisdom, and goodness, in the government of the Universal King?

Richard Watson says ("Inst.," II. 6):

> As to the source of evil, the following are the leading opinions which have been held. *Necessity*, arising out of the nature of things; the *Manichean* principle

> of duality, or the existence of a good and an evil Deity; the doctrine that God is the efficient *cause* or *author* of sin; and, finally, that evil is the result of the abuse of the *moral freedom* with which rational and accountable creatures are endowed. With respect to the first, as *the necessity* meant is independent of God, it refutes itself. For if all creatures are under the influence of this necessity—and they must be under it if it arise out of the *nature of things* itself—no virtue could now exist: from the moment of creation the deteriorating principle must begin its operation, and go on until all good is extinguished. Nor could there be any return from vice to virtue, since the nature of things would, on that supposition, be

counteracted, which is impossible.

The second is scarcely worth notice, since no one now advocates it. This heresy, which prevailed in several parts of the Christian world from the third to the sixteenth century, seems to have been a modification of the ancient Magian doctrine superadded to some of the tenets of Christianity. Its leading principle was that our souls were made by the good principle and our bodies by the evil one; these two principles being, according to Mani, the founder of the sect, coeternal and independent of each other. These notions were supposed to afford an easy explanation of the origin of evil, and on that account were zealously propagated. It was, however, overlooked by the advocates of this scheme, that it left the difficulty without any alleviation at all; for "it is just as repugnant [says Archbishop King] to infinite goodness to create what it foresaw would be spoiled by another, as to create what would be spoiled by the constitution of its nature."

Mr. Watson had not the gift of prescience. He could not foresee that the man was then living who would advocate "the Manichean principle of dualism" as the only way of accounting for the existence of both good and evil in the universe—that is, unless there be no God, a conclusion which teleology forbids; or the one God is "to good and evil equal bent," which, as has been seen, the plainest dictates of reason disallow. Over and above the fact that God everywhere proclaims himself the Monarch of the universe, "the blessed and only Potentate"—"I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me"—one cannot conceive of two eternal, self-existent, absolute, independent beings, of indefinite power, wisdom, and goodness or badness; for the one cannot be infinite in goodness, nor the other infinite in badness, for neither of them can be infinite in any thing—infinitude, preposterous as is the conception, must be divided between them! Then the evil in the universe is so blended with good as to be inseparable from it—both tending to the same telic results, in many instances, as is patent to our observation and experience. In thousands of instances we can see that the same hand which prepares our food prepares our medicine.

133

My Father's hand prepares the cup,
And what he wills is best.

"As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten." (Rev. iii. 19.) Mind it is he who loves that chastens. It is not an Ormuzd that does the

loving, and an Ahriman that does the chastening.

It was not an Ahriman that afflicted Job, but Jehovah himself. Neither Satan, nor the Sabeans, nor the Chaldeans, nor the fire, nor the wind, could do him the slightest injury without God's appointment or permission. And it is safe to say that there is not an unmixed cup placed to the lips of any man in this present life; and Mr. Mill himself would hardly say that Ormuzd and Ahriman join together in putting in the ingredients of good and evil to fill the cup! Besides, one and the same material fact, or formal cause, has various ends—operates as many final causes—yet, being but one identical act, it can spring from but one and the same agent. Thus it has passed into a proverb, "What is one man's meat is another man's poison." "It is an ill wind that blows nobody any good." There is scarcely a phenomenon in nature or providence that does not illustrate this principle. Too little attention has been bestowed upon this point, which enters so viscerally into teleology, and has so important a bearing upon the great question concerning the unity and infinite perfection of God. This alone is sufficient to demolish the hypothesis of dualism, and for that purpose it is brought forward in this place.

Pascal says nothing is demonstrably certain but that whose converse is manifestly false. When, therefore, a proposition is incomprehensible to us, instead of rejecting it on that account, we should examine its opposite, and if that is manifestly false, the proposition is true, though in the nature of the case incomprehensible. Thus in mathematics we prove the truth of a proposition by showing that its converse is absurd. So it is much easier to believe that the perfections of God are compatible with the existence of evil than to believe that the world was produced partly by a Supreme Being and partly by an inferior—the former beneficent, the latter maleficent—or that beneficence and maleficence are blended in one infinite being—a contradictory conception!

§ 9. Imperfection Inherent in the Finite.

134

Those who urge the objection in question seem to overlook the fact that imperfection is inherent in the finite. This points to the

modicum of truth there is in the notion of the old optimist philosophers, who held that matter has in it an inherent defect and tendency to disorder, which baffled the skill of the great Artificer himself to form it into a perfect mold; and that moral evil as necessarily follows from finite, and therefore imperfect, natures. No imputation, they infer, can be cast upon the Creator, whose goodness, they contend, is abundantly manifest in correcting many of those evils by skillful contrivance, and rendering them, in numerous instances, the occasion of good. To this also is added the doctrine of general laws, according to which, they argue, the universe must be conducted; but that, however well-set and constituted general laws may be, they will often thwart and cross one another; and that from thence particular inconveniences will arise. The constitution of things is, however, good *on the whole*, and that is all which can be required.

Mr. Pope adopts this optimism in his "Essay on Man;" and it is favored, less or more, by most systems of natural theology. We do not wonder, however, that it does not have much weight with atheists. God needs no such apology, nor would the theist in vindicating eternal providence, if he would be guided by the light of revelation.

But, as we have intimated, there is, as there is in most systems of error, a modicum of truth in this. Absolute perfection belongs alone to God. We do not limit Omnipotence when we say he could not make another infinite, absolutely perfect being—that is, another God. Let him begin the work of creation at any point he pleases, there must be aback of it the eternity *a parte ante*. Omnipotence cannot make a being whose existence is from eternity, though it may extend to eternity—*a parte post*. Omnipotence cannot make another omnipotence. God may make a being as weak as an animalcule or as strong as an angel "that excels in strength;" but, contrasted with Omnipotence, the angel and the animalcule are alike without strength. So of all other qualities. However highly endowed a creature may be, he is still at an infinite distance from the infinite God. His power, wisdom, and goodness are limited, and O, to what a restricted range!

If the limitations of finite beings are imperfections, then all

are imperfect. The cherubim that excel in strength and knowledge are weakness and ignorance contrasted with Omnipotence and

Infinite Wisdom. The seraphim, that have reached the highest point in moral excellence ever obtained by the creature, veil their faces with their wings in the presence of Infinite Goodness.

> And humbled into nothing own,
> Holy and pure is God alone.

Thus, were there no taint of sin in the universe, an inherent and necessary imperfection is stamped upon all God's creatures, from the atom to the seraph. Every one might have been different from what it is—millions of alternate forms and characters were within the choice of the infinitely good Creator; but why he should choose any of them rather than those he has chosen, Mr. Mill himself could scarcely tell us. One greater than he asks: "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" (Rom. ix. 20, 21.) Vessels of different material and size and shape and finish and use and position are called for and provided. Who would want them all alike? "But in a great house"—like God's universe—"there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor and some to dishonor." (2 Tim. ii. 20.) That is to say, some for a higher use, like angels and men; some for a lower use, like the irrational and inanimate creation.

"Variety is the spice of life that gives it all its flavor," or at least a great deal of it. Who loves sameness? Who wants every body and every thing to be exactly alike—*alter idem*? The great glory of the created universe consists largely in its endless variety. No two angels, no two men, no two animals, no two leaves or flowers or any other vegetables, no two drops of water or grains of sand, or any other inanimate objects, are exactly alike. In fact, this endless variety and inequality bespeak the divine Original of all.

> Order is heaven's first law; and this confessed,
> Some are, and must be, greater than the rest;
> More rich, more wise; hut who infers from hence
> That such are happier shocks all common sense.

With exquisite taste and skill Milton makes Satan admire the boundless variety of creation:

Terrestial heaven, danced round by other heavens
That shine, yet bear their bright officious lamps,
Light above light, for thee alone, as seems
In thee concent'ring all their precious beams
Of sacred influence! As God in heaven
Is center, yet extends to all; so thou
Cent'ring, receivest from all those orbs; in thee,
Not in themselves, all their known virtue appears
Productive in herb, plant, and nobler birth
Of creatures animate with gradual life
Of growth, sense, reason, all summed up in Man.
With what delight could I have walked thee round,
If I could joy in aught! sweet interchange
Of hill and valley, rivers, woods, and plains,
Now land, now sea, and shores with forest-crowned
Rocks, dens, and caves!
—*Par. Lost*, ix. 103–118.

Who would wish to reduce this luxuriant variety to the sameness and tameness of a Dutch garden? It seems some would. All the objects must be infinitely great and infinitely beautiful! Heaven must have no rocks and hills and brooks and vales; but all must be one vast, unbounded prairie, with nothing to break the tiresome monotony! How much better is the universe as God has made it! How much better is it for us, in particular, that all living creatures are not men—that we have "our poor relations," in the numerous species of the animal kingdom, on the one hand, and that

We are near allied
To angels on our better side.

Soame Jenyns, in his "Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil," says that Omnipotence cannot work contradictions; that all evils owe their existence to the necessity of their nature, and the Almighty is limited by the nature of things. If by this he simply means that in the nature of things creatures are finite, and Omnipotence cannot make them otherwise, that is necessarily, demonstrably true, as the converse is obviously absurd. It is impertinent, therefore, in this respect, to ask, "Who created the 'nature of things' by which the Almighty is limited and circumscribed?"

It argues no lack of ability or goodness in God that moral evil exists. Free moral agents could not be created without the

liability to sin. This is no impeachment of the power or wisdom or goodness of God. Necessitated virtue is a solecism. If God were a being of infinite power and malevolence, he could not force a free agent to sin; so as he is a being of infinite power and goodness, he cannot force a free agent to retain his primeval rectitude. All that the divine perfections can do, or should be expected to do, is to make free agents perfectly upright, to furnish them with the capacity of remaining so, and to give them the highest inducements to perpetuate their integrity. This God did in the case of both angels and men. There is sound reasoning as well as sublime poetry in the language which Milton put into the mouth of the Most High where he speaks of the fall of man:

> Ingrate, he had of me
> All he could have; I made him just and right,
> Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
> Such I created all th' ethereal Pow'rs
> And Spirits, both them who stood and them who failed
> Freely they stood, who stood—and fell, who fell.
> Not free, what proof could they have giv'n sincere
> Of true allegiance, constant faith, or love,
> Where only what they needs must do appeared.
> Not what they would? What praise could they receive?
> What pleasure I from such obedience paid,
> When will and reason (reason also is choice)
> Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled,
> Made passive both, had served necessity,
> Not me? They, therefore, as to right belonged,
> So were created, nor can justly accuse
> Their Maker, or their making, or their fate,
> As if predestination overruled
> Their will, disposed by absolute decree
> Of high foreknowledge; they themselves decreed
> Their own revolt, not I. If I foreknew,
> Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault,

Which had no less proved certain unforeknown.
So without least impulse or shadow of fate,
Or aught by me immutably foreseen,
They trespass, authors to themselves in all
Both what they judge and what they choose; for so
I formed them free, and free they must remain,
Till they enthrall themselves. I else must change
Their nature, and revoke the high decree
Unchangeable, eternal, which ordained
Their freedom; they themselves ordained their fall.
—*Par. Lost*, iii. 97–128.

138

Tulloch well says: "To all who have gone beyond the mere surface of speculation, the good is felt, under whatever appearances to the contrary, to be the divine order, of which the evil is an invasion. The parallel existence of evil is not entitled to set aside the good, but only to arrest us in our full conclusions regarding it. It does not destroy our theodicy—it only leaves it imperfect. The divine meaning of nature, on the very lowest view, is not altogether doubtful and contradictory, but only incomplete."

It argues no lack of power in God that he cannot make one and the same being free and necessary, any more than it argues a lack of power that God cannot make an object both square and round. It is childish to quibble about a point so obvious. So of the divine wisdom. It would be ill employed in devising expedients to accomplish any thing so preposterous, and goodness never prompts wisdom and power to engage in any such Quixotic undertakings. It may, indeed, be said that, as wisdom foresaw that moral agents would abuse their freedom, and involve themselves in sin and misery, goodness would prevent the exertion of Omnipotence in the creation of moral agents. But how is a question of that sort to be settled? If submitted to those who are hopelessly depraved and miserable, they might indeed say: "It were better for us that we had never been born." But let the question be submitted to those who have never fallen, or having fallen are redeemed, and confirmed in virtue by their free and cheerful continuance in well-doing, and what is the answer? From millions of voices, angelic and human, will ascend to the throne of God to all eternity the loftiest ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving to the great Creator for

endowing them with the high prerogative of liberty, the capacity of knowing and loving and serving and enjoying the Author of their being forever and ever. One might be content to let the Creator himself settle such a question, as he has settled it—for we know, as a matter of consciousness, against which it were absurd to argue, that he has created such beings—but if moral agents themselves should be called in, whose testimony should be heard? that of those who have carried out the benevolent designs of the Creator, and by their free choice of his service have had their virtue confirmed and their happiness secured? or that of those who have abused their liberty and involved themselves in

sin and misery? To propound such a question is to answer it, and to answer it is to solve the problem of the existence of moral evil, and to demonstrate its perfect compatibility with the infinite power and wisdom and goodness of God. The argument might be extended and strengthened by a reference to the undeniable fact, which is a matter of consciousness, that even in our probationary state, while the issues of life hang in doubtful scale, we are glad that we were made free and not necessary agents—moral and immortal beings—as we know that all means and facilities are afforded to us to make an eternal existence not an everlasting curse, but an everlasting blessing. Here and there we may find a miserable, moody misanthrope, who says that he envies the dog at his feet (as did Col. Gardiner before his conversion), because the brute has no moral agency, no responsibility, no immortality; but one does not go to Newgate or Bedlam for suffrages as to what the powers that be, human or divine, ought to do or forbear doing. Even culprits do not generally regret that they were endowed with the high and tremendous prerogative of freedom which they have abused, but that they are forced to suffer the consequences of the abuse. Instead of necessitated virtue—if such an absurd, self-contradictory thing were possible—they would choose unbridled license, with no fear of retribution. They do not quarrel with liberty, but with the sanctions by which it is environed; for there may be but few hardened criminals who expiate their crimes on the gallows, that

> . . . find the halter draw
> With good opinion of the law.

Whether or not infinite power and wisdom and goodness

should be employed in the future state, with other expedients to deliver sinners, angelic or human, from the consequences of their crimes, or else to extinguish their being, is a question which does not belong to this discussion. He alone who possesses those perfections can solve that problem. The Scriptures intimate nothing of the sort, but rather the contrary. But one could admit almost any absurdity into his eschatology—even the making of immortal spirits mortal, and utterly annihilating them—rather than confound necessity with liberty by forcing the wicked to become virtuous, or by depriving the righteous of the high and glorious prerogative of liberty, in the exercise of which,

in obedience to the will of their Creator and Sovereign, they find his service perfect freedom.

This mode of accounting for the origin of moral evil and its compatibility with the divine perfections, as it is far more simple so it is far more satisfactory than the hypotheses of dualism, contrast, sense, and metaphysical imperfections, which do not meet the case. (See Julius Müller's "Christian Doctrine of Sin," Book II., and "Tulloch's Theism," pp. 388–395.)

§ 11. Objections Arising from Natural Evil Stated.

There is more difficulty in disposing of the objection to the wisdom, power, and goodness of God arising from the existence of natural evil than that which arises from the existence of moral evil. We will restate the objection in its full force. Atheists and dualists dilate upon the ills which flesh is heir to, the manifold calamities which take place in the world. They point to abortions—from buds and blossoms, which annually perish by millions, to the frequently occurring mishaps by which the fruit of the womb is blasted in the germ. Then there are monstrosities—the *lusus naturae* of the vegetal kingdom, and revolting bestial and human productions. Violence too seems to be the law of nature. Not only are vegetals destroyed by animals, but animals prey upon one another in all imaginable ways, and to an inconceivable extent. Every animal is both a murderer and a victim—from the animalcular parasites to the higher *carnivora* of earth, air, and ocean, including man, who destroys all creation, his own species not exempt! Tempests sweep

over the earth, and cities are leveled to the ground; over the sea, and whole navies are sunk. Floods descend in annual inundations that destroy the fruit of human toil and skill, or like the Noachian deluge which drowned the world. These are followed by droughts, when the heavens are brass and the earth is iron, and famine stalks through the world and destroys myriads of men and beasts. Frosts prevail at unusual times or in appalling extremes, and animal and vegetable life perishes. Earthquakes, with giant tread, shake the solid earth, and whole towns with their inhabitants go down to the pit. Eruptions from the Vesuviuses, Etnas, and Heclas of the world smother with liquid lava and ashes fertile fields and magnificent cities with their teeming population. Diseases—of which the old Jewish doctors numbered

nine hundred and three, and our nosologists do not much decrease the figures—"wait around to hurry mortals hence"—from ordinary ailments to endemics, epidemics, and plagues, which, baffling all the prudence and skill of man, go forth like Death on the pale horse with *Hades* following after—the grave engulfing all!

This is a sad picture, and it is not overdrawn. But it does not impeach the power or wisdom or goodness of God.

§ 12. First Answer to These Objections.

Some of these phenomena are not really evils: they are the inevitable conditions of finite existence. Let it be granted that this world, for instance, shall be stocked aud stored with vegetal and animal life. Some provision must be made for its perpetuation and support, and at the same time its restriction within due bounds. Of course, if there is an efficient cause—namely, God—he alone can comprehend and order the final causes of his own work. Is it any impeachment of his attributes if he sees proper to arrange the various orders of mineral, vegetal, and animal life so that they shall be governed by laws which secure their propagation and support, and at the same time, and by the same arrangements, their restriction within certain limits, so that the earth shall be replenished by them and yet not be overstocked? That millions of vegetal germs never come to perfection need not trouble us, if enough do so to secure the ends of their creation. God may have use

for such abortions of which we have no knowledge, as he has use for the untold millions of objects of exquisite form and color which "the dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear." May not God take pleasure in his own works? As the Author of beauty and utility, has he no esthetic taste—if we may so speak—as well as utilitarian purpose? There is really but one difficulty in this matter, and that is in the sufferings of the lower animals.

But if *we* cannot settle this question with certainty, no one can prove that *God* cannot. He has a perfect view of the subject; we see only a little part. We see enough, however, to justify the ways of God to men and brutes. The lower animals in general seem to have great enjoyment of life—from the ephemera which sports its life's short day in the sunbeam to the whale which flounders in rollicking pleasure in his ocean home for a century.

They prey upon each other, it is true, but this affords them great satisfaction, and gives them exciting employment, while it saves individuals from slow decays and lingering diseases, and the various species from overstocking the earth. As they have nothing higher than a sensitive nature, and the lowest species seem to have scarcely any sensation, it is not likely that they suffer as much as we, with our higher organization, imagine. It may do for poetry, but not for philosophy or theology, to say:

> The poor beetle that we tread upon
> In corporal sufferance finds a pang as great
> As when a giant dies.

It is not so—we know that it is not so. In many cases—the vast preponderance of cases—a life of pleasure, as great as their slightly developed sensations allow, is terminated with scarcely any pain. Millions of animalcules are destroyed in a second; beasts of prey generally crush their victims with a single blow; whole schools of fish are gulped down by a whale before they know what has hurt them. "The pain of death is most in apprehension," and they have none of that—unless that instinct which gives caution and artifice to the individual, so as to preserve the species, may be dignified by that name. We can imagine, and infinite wisdom may be assured, that the counterbalances in the animal kingdom are such as to make the plan which has been adopted, all things considered, the very best that could be devised. We are not driven to the *anserine*

philosophy of Mr. Pope:

> See all things for my use—
> "And man for mine," replies the pampered goose.

The animals were made for their own enjoyment of life, and upon the whole they have a good time upon the earth; but they were made also to subserve tho interests of man, the lord of this lower world, as well as for the pleasure of the great Creator himself. It is not true that

> He sees with equal eyes, as God of all,
> A hero perish, or a sparrow fall.

Man is "of more value than many sparrows," and the common sense of mankind, as well as Jesus Christ, says so! The pains of the lower creatures are more than counterbalanced by the pleasures which they enjoy through the bounty of providence, while they minister in a thousand ways to the comfort

and support of their earthly sovereign. They are "our poor relations," and dreary and desolate would this world be without them. Some of them are noxious and troublesome, and we sometimes think they could well be dispensed with; but the old schoolmen may not have been very far wrong when they ruled that, though it is lawful to destroy individuals that trouble us, it would not be right to exterminate any one entire species—as the balance of creation might be thereby destroyed. We need not therefore resort to the notion held by some learned men that there is a *post-mortem* existence for the lower animals, in which they shall be compensated for the undeserved sufferings of the present life—though that hypothesis is far less absurd than that which attributes their sufferings to divine malevolence—which is as gratuitous as it is impious, as has been sufficiently shown.

§ 13. Second Answer.

Many of the calamities in question are designed as punitive visitations of providence, to remind sinners that there is a God that judgeth in the earth. It is true that when the scourge overflows, he laugheth at the trial of the innocent—that is, in plain prose, the

innocent frequently suffer with the wicked in wide-spread calamities. That is admitted; that everybody knows. God does not now, as he sometimes did in ancient days, draw a line of demarkation between the Egyptians and the Israelites, when the former were plagued and the latter were signally exempted. But, as the good must die as well as the wicked, the calamity which is a curse to the latter proves a blessing to the former, who in the recompense of another world will not complain of the calamities which hurried them from this.

§ 14. Third Answer.

Then again, many of these so-called evils are real blessings, as they enter into the disciplinary dispensation of a gracious Sovereign and a loving Father. They serve as admonitions warning us what God can do, and what he will do in case we are disloyal subjects and disobedient children. If we receive the chastisement he will spare us greater inflictions. We need correction, as we have sinned, and are prone to sin; we need physic as well as food; and it requires as much skill and kindness to supply the former as the latter. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." There is really

no mystery about this—there is not the slightest difficulty in it. God disciplines us in our probationary state to prepare us for an eternal state. The poet says:

> Good when he gives, supremely good,
> Nor less when he denies;
> E'en crosses from his sovereign hand
> Are blessings in disguise.

Hardly "in disguise." There is a silver lining to every cloud, a smiling face behind every frowning providence. It is not chance, it is not mischance; much less cruelty.

Here come in the commonplaces of the Bible and of Christian experience, as to the untold value of sanctified afflictions, ending in death. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." (2 Cor. iv. 17.) Indeed, the sanctified trials of life, with the eternal

compensations of heaven, constitute one of the brightest illustrations of the infinite power and wisdom and goodness of God. There is a dignity—we had almost said a divinity—in sanctified sorrow. So Taylor in Philip Van Artevelde:

> He that lacks time to mourn lacks time to mend:
> Eternity mourns that. 'Tis an ill cure
> For life's worst ills to have no time to feel them.
> Where sorrow's held intrusive, and turned out,
> There wisdom will not enter, nor true power,
> Nor aught that dignifies humanity.

All difficulty vanishes from the problem of temporal suffering in the light of the gospel, which points to that grace which sanctifies our sorrows, and to that immortality which indemnifies us for them.

> 'Tis immortality deciphers man,
> And opens all the mysteries of his nature.
> Without it all his instincts were a riddle;
> Without it all his nature were a dream;
> But with it all is plain.

"Immortality," as Tulloch says, "comes as a beam piercing the darkness from a higher region of wisdom and love, of truth and justice, touching what were otherwise dim and strange with a radiance of heavenly significance, and the otherwise unmeaning ciphers of time changing to orders of untold value."

§ 15. Objection Drawn from Future Retribution Met.

In regard to future retribution, which will consist in misery

as the punishment of sin, and happiness as the reward of virtue, this is no impeachment of the moral attributes of God, if it can be shown that they are designed to act as incentives to obedience in the present probationary state, and actually do thus operate, and that the award of both the one and the other will inure to the protection of the virtue and happiness of all the loyal subjects of Jehovah's realm. Surely it is no impeachment of any government that there is a provision made for the apprehension and

incarceration of criminals and outlaws. How can it be shown that there is any thing contrary to power, wisdom, or goodness in the judgment of the last day, when all incorrigible offenders shall be separated from the righteous, and be shut up in the prison of the universe? It is surely agreeable to all those perfections of the Godhead that every one shall "receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. v. 10.)

§ 16. A Final Answer.

But finite beings cannot judge in all respects of the Infinite. We can judge this much—that God is very powerful, very wise, and very good; but we cannot aver, from any thing that we see or fail to see, that his power is qualified by weakness, his wisdom by ignorance or folly, and his goodness by pravity or malevolence. We cannot, because we have not all the factors to work out the mighty problem. He alone who made the universe knows how it should be governed; he alone can govern it; he alone does govern it. The challenge of Eliphaz to Job is here in place: "Should it be according to thy mind?" Is it becoming in short-sighted, feeble, sinful mortals to prescribe or dictate to the Creator and Ruler of the universe? Is it modest in such poor creatures as we are to impeach his power and wisdom and love? The very first *gravamen* that we shall adduce, when seen with clearer eyes than we now have, and from a higher stand-point than that which we now occupy, shall prove a glorious illustration of those divine perfections. No theist is bound to explain all the mysteries of creation and providence, and to account for all the apparent moral and natural evils in the universe, any more than he is bound to *comprehend* the infinite nature of God before he can *apprehend* his being and attributes. We can acquaint ourselves with God and be at peace, and know him so as to trust him, love him, worship him, obey him, and

enjoy him forever; though neither in this life nor in the life everlasting shall we be able by searching to find out God—to find out the Almighty to perfection. By a modest, meek, and devout seeking after God, and study of his character as revealed in his works and his word, we shall find out more of his perfections and

be cheered with the assurance that, though to all eternity

Hills peep o'er hills and Alps on Alps arise,

yet a thousand problems now painfully insoluble shall then be as plain as are now the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.

[Upon supposition that God exercises a moral government over the world, the analogy of his natural government suggests and makes it credible that his moral government must be a scheme quite beyond our comprehension: and this affords a general answer to all objections against the justice and goodness of it. It is most obvious, analogy renders it highly credible, that upon supposition of a moral government it must be a scheme —for the world and the whole natural government of it appears to be so— to be a scheme, system, or constitution whose parts correspond to each other, and to a whole, as really as any work of art or as any particular model of a civil constitution and government. In this great scheme of the natural world individuals have various peculiar relations to other individuals of their own species. And whole species are, we find, variously related to other species upon this earth. Nor do we know how much further these kinds of relations may extend. And as there is not any action or natural event which we are acquainted with, so single and unconnected as not to have a respect to some other actions and events; so possibly each of them, when it has not an immediate, may yet have a remote, natural relation to other actions and events, much beyond the compass of this present world. . . . Nor can we give the whole account of any one thing whatever; of all its causes, ends, and necessary adjuncts; those adjuncts, I mean, without which it could not have been. By this most astonishing connection—these reciprocal correspondences and mutual relations—every thing which we see in the course of nature is actually brought about, and things seemingly the most insignificant imaginable, are perpetually observed to be necessary conditions to other things of the greatest importance. . . . The natural world then, and natural government of it, being such an incomprehensible scheme—so incomprehensible that a man must really in the literal sense know nothing at all, who is not sensible of his ignorance in it—this immediately suggests, and strongly shows the credibility that the moral world and government of it may be so too. Indeed, the natural and moral constitution and government of the world are so connected as to make up together but one scheme; and it is highly probable that the first is formed and carried on merely in subserviency to the latter, as the vegetable world is for the animal, and organized bodies for minds.[4]]

1. The doctrine that efficiency, or efficient cause, resides only in will, divine or created—man having the power to modify nature and to project original influences and to introduce changes which perpetuate themselves in their consequences—and that the forces operating in the universe are a never-ceasing exercise of the Divine Will, in which alone a sufficient and ultimate source of this energy can be found, is advocated by Dr. Sam. Clarke, Dugald Stewart, John Wesley, Nitzsch [Friedrich August, possibly Karl Immanuel—*somercet*], Julius Müller, Thomas Chalmers, Harris, Young, Dr. Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Dr. Whewell, President Bascom, Principal Tulloch, Rowland G. Hazard, Sir John Herschel, the Duke of Argyll, Alfred Russell Wallace, Proctor, Crocker, and Alexander Winchell. Winchell ("Reconciliation of Science and Religion," p. 258) says: "This conception of supreme, intelligent power, enthroned at the fountain head of phenomena, and displaying its activity in force acting upon atoms and aggregates of matter, does not differ, so far as this qualification goes, from the conceptions set forth by Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, and Dubois-Reymond." One of the most profound and exhaustive discussions of the whole doctrine of causality to be found in our language is embraced in Articles IV., V., and IX. of Winchell's "Reconciliation of Science and Religion." I was a pupil of Dr. Winchell's at the time of the publication of this volume (1877); and, after its perusal, enjoyed the additional advantage of listening to his lucid and eloquent personal expositions. Dr. Summers frequently expressed great satisfaction and delight with Dr. Winchell's views on this subject.—T.↩
2. See the latter part of the quotation on p. 52.—T.↩
3. Paley's "Natural Theology," Chap. XXVI., pp. 470–473, in American Ed. of Complete Works, Philadelphia, 1850. This passage is also quoted at length, with many transpositions and some additions, by Watson, "Institutes" Part II., Chap. VI., pp. 234–236.—T.↩
4. Butler's "Analogy," Pt. I., Chap. vii.↩

Part II. The Trinity.

Chapter I. The Doctrine Stated in Contrast with Opposing Errors.

§ 1. Positive Statement.

147

The last clause of the article, and that which particularly gives it its title, is this: “And in the unity of this Godhead there are three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.”

The Greek word *Trias*, Triad, as applied to the Deity, came into use in the second century. It is used by Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 181, who speaks of the three days of creation which preceded the creation of the sun and moon, as types of the Trinity—of God and his word and his wisdom: τύποι τῆς Τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ.[1] Tertullian (A.D. 200) was the first Latin who used the term *Trinitas* (*Adv. Praxeas*, c. iii.). The Council of Alexandria gave the word synodical authority A.D. 317. The Greek *Triad* is more than represented by the Latin *Trinitas*, from *trini*—three each. So are formed Triune, Triunity, from *tres*—three—and *unus, unitas*—one, unity—that is, three-one.

The *triad* of course refers to the persons, the *unitas* to the essence. In the Latin recension of the article the reading is *ejusdem essentiae*, of the same essence. There is one common Godhead, one divine essence, one spiritual substance, which is absolutely a unit.

§ 2. Opposed to Tritheism.

Opposed to this is tritheism, a heresy which was inculcated by john Ascusnages, a Syrian philosopher of the sixth century. He held that there are three beings, distinct in essence, as well as in personality. This is the same as saying that there are

148

three gods. But tritheism, as we have shown, is not trinitarianism. This article, of the Trinity, is palpably opposed to tritheism, as it unequivocally asserts the absolute unity of the Godhead.

§ 3. Opposed to Arianism.

It is also opposed to Arianism in all its modifications. If the Son and the Holy Spirit be not consubstantial with the Father, then they are distinct beings. If they are not of the same essence, they must be inferior. They may be of a like nature, but if they are not of the same nature, then they are creatures—and Arius called the Son a creature, and the Holy Spirit the creature of a creature, because he proceedeth from the Father through the Son. It is the language of polytheism to call them gods, if they ever had a beginning, and so do not possess the same essence with the Father. Arianism therefore holds a trinity—if the word may be so abused—which consists of three persons—the great God and two inferior gods. This is, indeed, another form of tritheism, and stands in a hostile relation to this article.

§ 4. Opposed to Sabellianism.

On the other hand, the article stands opposed to Sabellianism. Sabellius was an African presbyter of the third century. He held that there are no *personal* distinctions in the Godhead. He allowed the use of the terms Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as setting forth the one divine *person* under three different *aspects* and in three different *relations*. Thus the same *person* is manifested at one time as Father, at another time as Son, and at another time as Holy Spirit, according to the functions which he exercised and the relations which he assumed. As therefore the Son was the same person as the Father, the Father suffered on the cross: hence the Sabellians are called Patripassians.

This heresy has been revived in a modified form by Emanuel Swedenborg. He held that Jesus is Jehovah manifested in the flesh, that his humanity is divine, and that in his person dwells the whole Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—the Father was the soul of the humanity, while the humanity was the Son, and the virtue emanating from it was the Holy Spirit; they thus form one God, just as the soul, the body, and their operation form one man. As Swedenborg seems to have been a deranged though learned man, it is useless to attempt to define his absurdities, or to refute them.

149

Socinianism also denies the tripersonality of the Godhead. Lelius Socinus, who lived about the time of the Reformation, and Faustus Socinus, his nephew, denied the Deity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit. According to them, Christ was a mere man, who had no existence before he was born of Mary; he had no proper Godhead, but only a delegated divinity. The Holy Spirit is but a virtue, or emanation of the Father. Thus, as there is but one divine nature, there is but one divine Person. Paul of Samosata, in the third century, substantially held these views.

The Socinians, or Unitarians, as they call themselves, object against Trinitarianism that it is self-contradictory—teaching that one is three and three are one. But Trinitarians do not teach that they are so in the same sense; if they did they would be absurdly self-contradictory. No one could believe any thing so irrational. But God may be one in one sense, and three in another sense, without any contradiction.

They also demand a definition of the word *person* and an illustration of the triunity, which cannot be furnished.

Neither the term trinity, nor the expression "three persons," is found in the Scriptures; they infer, therefore, that the things signified by those terms are not found there. But that does not follow. If God is spoken of with a threefold distinction, and if of each of the three distinctions personal actions and relations are predicated, may not the terms trinity and persons be employed as convenient representatives of these ideas? For the sake of convenience some term was needed to express the distinctions in question, and the Greeks adopted the word ὑπόστασις, which in Hebrews i. 3 is rendered in the Vulgate *substantia*, and in our version *person*. There, indeed, it may mean subsistence in the sense of essence or nature; but it may mean also "person," as our translators understood it. As the Son is spoken of as distinct from the Father, and as he is not distinct from him in essence, if he is his image, or likeness, it must be in another sense, and that we call a personal sense. Before the Council of Nice the Latins used the term *persona* to represent the Greek ὑπόστασις, and in the Greek lexicons it is explained by the term πρόσωπον, which means *person*. This

word does not mean “a mask,” or mere representation, or mode of manifestation—that is

Sabellianism—nor does it mean individual, a being distinct from all other individuals or beings, though united to others by an indissoluble bond. The three *hypostases* or *subsistences*, according to the Greek, and the three *persons*, according to the Latin, constitute but one Divine Being, in which there are distinctions and relations represented by the pronouns *I, thou, he.* Hence the *Triunity* is appropriately called a *Tripersonality*.

§ 6. Illustrations of the Trinity.

We have not much to say in favor of illustrations of the Trinity. Some have sought for types in a triangle; a trefoil; motion, light, and heat, in the sun; reason, will, and memory, or power, intellect, and will, in the soul; and other natural or spiritual phenomena, to set forth and explain the personal distinctions in the essential unity; but they all fail to illustrate this great mystery; as they either look toward tritheism on the one hand, or toward Sabellianism on the other.

Nor art nor nature can supply
Sufficient forms of majesty.

St. Augustin says (“City of God,” XI. 26): “We indeed recognize in ourselves the image of God—that is, of the Supreme Trinity—an image which, though it be not equal to God, or rather, though it be very far removed from him—being neither co-eternal nor, to say all in a word, consubstantial with him—is yet nearer to him in nature than any other of his works, and is destined to be yet restored, that it may bear a still closer resemblance. For we both are, and know that we are, and delight in our being, and our knowledge of it.”

This approaches nearer “an image of the Supreme Trinity,” perhaps, than any thing else, and it is favored by the fact that man was made in the image of God; but the scriptural notion of that image is not being (the Father), knowledge (the Son), and delight (the Holy Spirit). Thus, whatever use may be made of this subtilty in speaking of the Trinity, one can hardly consider it an adequate illustration of this mystery.

Dr. Donne says (Sermon on Rev. iv. 8.), there are adumbrations of the Trinity in nature. He does not tell us what they are; but in the same discourse he says: “For the Trinity itself, it is *lux*, but *lux inaccessibilis*. It is light, for a child at baptism professes to see it; but then it is so inaccessible a light as that if we will make natural reason our *medium* to discern it by, it

will fall within that of David, *posuit tenebras latibulum suum*. God hath made darkness his secret place. God, as God, will be seen in the creature; there in the creature he is light—light accessible to our reason; but God in the Trinity is open to no other light than the light of faith. . . . Sometimes we represent God by subtraction, by negation, by saying God is that which is not mortal, not passible, nor movable. Sometimes we present him by addition, by adding our bodily lineaments to him and saying that God hath hands and feet and ears and eyes; and adding our affections and passions to him, saying that God is glad or sorry, angry or reconciled, as we are. Some such things may be done toward the representing of God, as God; but toward the expressing of the distinction of the Persons in the Trinity, nothing. . . . If we think to see this mystery of the Trinity by the light of reason, we shall lose that hold which we had before; our natural faculties, our reason, will be perplexed and enfeebled; and our supernatural, our faith, not strengthened that way.” In his sermon on Genesis xviii. 25, he says: “Though God’s appearing thus in three persons be no irrefragable argument to prove the Trinity against the Jews, yet it is a convenient illustration of the Trinity to thee that art a Christian; and therefore be not too curious in searching reasons and demonstrations of the Trinity, but yet accustom thyself to meditations upon the Trinity on all occasions, and find impressions of the Trinity in the three faculties of thine own soul—thy reason, thy will, and thy memory; and seek a reparation of that thy Trinity by a new Trinity, by faith in Christ Jesus, by hope of him, and by a charitable delivering him to others in a holy and exemplar life.” “Impressions of the Trinity,” like these, are truly of little worth.

The Hutchinsonians, of whom the lexicographer Parkhurst was one, held that the stated operations of nature are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens, in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning; that the heavens thus framed by Almighty Wisdom are an instituted

emblem and visible substitute of *Jehovah Aleim*—the Eternal Three, the co-equal and co-adorable Trinity in Unity; that the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence, and the distinction of conditions, the personality in Deity, without confounding the Persons or

dividing the substance; and that from their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew, *shemim*—the names, representatives, or substitutes—expressing by their names that they are emblems, and by their conditions or offices what it is of which they are emblems. It is hardly necessary to stop to expose the futility of all such fancies, based as they are upon a universally exploded system of the universe.

After Coleridge repudiated unitarianism, and became a trinitarian, he attempted a demonstration of this mystery by the use of diagrams, which look more like the fancies of a daydreamer than any thing like the solid, substantial work of a true theologian—but this Coleridge was not.

§ 7. The Trinity a Doctrine of Revealed Religion Only.

The doctrine contradicts none of the phenomena of the universe, while it is neither declared nor illustrated by any. It cannot be discovered by nature or the light of reason—it is a matter of pure revelation. It has indeed been held—generally with grotesque distortions—by nearly all heathen nations, of which the proofs are abundant in Dr. Dwight's seventy-first sermon, "But," as he says, "when we consider that the doctrine of a Triad has been so evidently received without a question, in all the four quarters of the globe, and by so many different nations; that it was received among almost all those who were ancient; that it was received independently of the Scriptures; that it was expressed in so many forms, and those completely decisive as to the real meaning; that the scheme in all these forms was, unanswerably, the union of three Divine Beings, or Persons, in One; and that the scheme was so often and so definitely explained in multiplied and very various modes of expression—modes of expression, too, which are incapable of being misconstrued—we cannot, I think, fail to determine that the doctrine of the Trinity was originally revealed to the human race,

and has almost everywhere been conveyed down, both in their worship and sacred traditions."

1. Ad Autolycum, Lib. II., p. 106.↩

Chapter II. Scripture Proofs of the Doctrine.

§ 1. The Old Testament.

153
The Triunity of God, like his existence, is not so much *revealed* in the Old Testament as *assumed*. The names of God are expressive of his nature. Hence he is frequently called *Jehovah Elohim*. Jehovah means "He who exists." It is singular in its form, and expresses the unity of the divine essence. *Elohim* means "mighty ones." It is plural in its form, and expresses the plurality of persons in the one divine essence. It is frequently used with pronouns and verbs in the singular number, *e. g.* (Gen. i. 1): *bara Elohim*, where *bara*, he created, is singular, while *Elohim* is plural. Some account for it by making it the *pluralis majestaticus*, or *excellentiae*—the plural of majesty or of excellence. But that will hardly account for its use in this anomalous way—in the books of Moses alone over five hundred times! It is remarkable, too, that when prominence is to be given to the *society*, or plurality, of persons in the Godhead, the regular construction is preserved, as in Genesis i. 26, "*Elohim said*, Let *us* make man in *our* image"—where the noun, pronoun, and verbs are all alike plural, indicating the three Divine Persons—

> Who joined in council to create
> The dignity of man!

It is observable too that while the plural *Elohim*, is frequently joined with singular pronouns and verbs, the singular Jehovah is occasionally joined with plural pronouns and verbs, *e. g.*: "*Jehovah* said. Let *us* go down." In Isaiah vi. 8 another name of God is used in a similar way—in verse 3 he is called "Jehovah of hosts," but in verse 8 he is called *Adonai*, which is also singular, and yet it is used with both a singular and a plural pronoun. "And I heard the voice of the Lord [*Adonai*] saying. Whom shall *I* send? and who will go for *us*?" And this case is the more remarkable from the fact that the seraphim are there represented as chanting their *trisagion*, or threefold ascription

154

to the Deity: “And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts.” From John xii. 41, and Acts xxviii. 25, it appears that not the Father only, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit, are here recognized. The threefold form of the high-priestly benediction in the temple singularly corresponds with this triplicity. In Isaiah xlviii. 16 the Messiah is spoken of in prophecy as saying, “And now *Adonai Jehovah* hath sent me and his Spirit”—where the economical Trinity is specified. The references to the Son of God and the Spirit of God in the Old Testament corroborate this view. (Ps. ii. 7–12; Gen. i. 2; vi. 3; Ps. cxliii. 10; Joel ii. 28.)

§ 2. Modern Jewish and Rationalistic Criticism.

Modern Jews indeed, and some rationalistic Christian critics, resolve all this into grammatical idioms and the like; but so did not the ancient Jews nor the Fathers of the Church? The Chaldee paraphrasts and other Jewish commentators, Philo, Menachen, Rambam, and other eminent rabbis, understand those passages in the Old Testament substantially as we do. (See the testimonies in Dr. Dwight’s Sermon lxxi.) The Fathers from Justin Martyr down frequently refer to the Old Testament for proofs of the Trinity. Of course they lay principal stress, as we do, on the more patent and pregnant proofs of the New Testament.

§ 3. The New Testament Proofs.

The Fathers were wont to say, If you want a theophany go to Jordan; there is a manifestation of the Triune God—the Father speaking from the heavens, the Son visible in his humanity, and the Holy Ghost symbolized by a dove which descended and rested upon the Son. (Matt. iii. 13–17.) Then there is the formula of baptism: “Go and disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” (Matt. xxviii. 19.) So the apostolic benediction, so nearly like the Aaronic: “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.” (2 Cor. xiii. 14.) The economical Trinity is also set forth in Ephesians ii. 18: “For through him [Christ] we both have access by one Spirit unto the

Father." *Cf.* Revelation i. 4, 5, where "the Seven Spirits," united with the Eternal Father and Jesus Christ in invocation, refers to the plenitude and

perfection of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit—seven being a number of perfection among the Jews, and the Revelation being written in the Jewish ideas.

To all these testimonies must be added the numerous passages which refer to the divinity and personality of the Son and of the Spirit, which will be adduced in treating on Articles II. and IV. We do not cite 1 John v. 7, as that is generally considered an interpolation from old Latin liturgies. It is not found in the ancient Greek MSS., and is never quoted by the Greek and Latin fathers in their controversies with antitrinitarians—and it is not needed.

§ 4. Antitrinitarian Objections Considered.

Antitrinitarians object to the doctrine of the Trinity that it is (1) incomprehensible, (2) self-contradictory, and (3) useless.

(1) It is admitted that it is incomprehensible. But so is the eternity and the self-existence of God, so is every one of the divine attributes. We can apprehend the statement—there are three Persons in one undivided essence—but we cannot comprehend the mystery of this triunity.

(2) But it is not self-contradictory. It is not affirmed that God is one and three in the same sense; that would be indeed a contradiction, and no sane man could believe it. But it is not contradictory to say that God is one in a certain sense—viz., in reference to his essence or substance, or divine nature—and that he is three in another sense—viz., his personal subsistence: "In Essence one, in Persons three."

(3) As to the uselessness of the doctrine, it is hardly modest for us to say what is useless or what is useful. To be able to determine a question of this sort, we must have the infinite knowledge of God, who alone comprehends his own nature and relations. Of one thing we may be sure, nothing that he reveals to us is unimportant. We may not see the importance of particular points, but that does not prove that they are trivial. In regard to the Trinity, ontologically considered, it may be true that the bearing of the dogma upon our

experience and practice may not be patent; but what has that to do with the importance of the doctrine in itself considered? Indeed, there is great satisfaction, great relief to the mind when meditating upon the eternity of God, to know that through the eternal generation of the Son and the eternal procession of the Spirit, there has ever

been *a society* in the Godhead. God has always had "a social nature, yet alone." Anselm says: "The relation of the Son to the Father is something elevated above all language. The expression *generation* is best suited to represent the relation, but yet it is symbolical. Further, as God knows himself, he loves himself; his love to himself presupposes his being and knowing. This is also denoted by the procession of the Holy Spirit from both; all these pass completely into one another, and thus constitute the unity of the Supreme Being."

The ontological immanent Trinity in Unity constitutes the basis of the economical Trinity. The Father had a Son begotten from eternity, that could be sent forth to make the world, and became incarnate for us men and our salvation—"God manifested in the flesh"—and the Father and the Son had a Spirit proceeding from them both from all eternity, that could be sent forth to our world to co-operate with the Son in works of creation, providence, and redemption. And since the names and attributes and works and honors of Deity are predicated of the Son and the Spirit, as well as of the Father, he must indeed be rash who will pronounce the doctrine of the Trinity a useless speculation. It it is true—and we have demonstrated its truth—then its importance is difficult to be overrated. It is indeed "a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation."

§ 5. Conclusion.

Omitting the damnatory clauses of the so-called Athanasian Creed, we heartily subscribe to its assertion: "The Catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of

the Holy Ghost is all one—the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal."

This agrees with the article: "And in unity of this Godhead, there are three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." As we have seen, "substance" here means essence—Latin, *essentia*; "power"—Latin, *potentia*—includes all the divine faculties or capacities, which are infinite; and eternity—Latin, *aeternitas*—expresses the unoriginated divinity of each Person of the Sacred Triad; for

whatever "subordination" to the Father may be suggested by the eternal generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit—so that each of the two may be spoken of as "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God"—yet this does not imply an origination of Essence, but a correlation of Persons—as has been guardedly expounded and irrefragably proved. Perhaps the doctrine of the Trinity has never been set forth in more concise scholastic terms than by the Ever Memorable John Hales, in his "Confession of the Trinity," as follows:

> God is one: numerically one; more one than any single man if unity could *suscipere magis et minus*: yet God is so one that he admits of distinction; and so admits of distinction that he still retains unity.
>
> As he is one, so we call him God, the Deity, the Divine Nature, and other names of the same signification: as he is distinguished, so we call him Trinity; Persons; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.
>
> In this Trinity there is one Essence; two Emanations; three Persons or Relations; four Properties; five Notions: a Notion is that by which any Person is known or signified.
>
> The one Essence is God which with this Relation, that it doth Generate or Beget, maketh the Person of the Father: the same Essence with this Relation, that it is Begotten, maketh the Person of the Son: the same Essence with this Relation, that it Proceedeth, maketh the Person of the Holy Ghost.
>
> The two Emanations are, to be Begotten and to Proceed or to be Breathed out: the Three Persons are Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: the three Relations, to Beget, to be Begotten, and to Proceed, or to be Breathed out. The four Properties are: the first, Inassibility and Inemanability; the second is to Generate—these belong to the Father: the third is to be Begotten; and this belongs to the Son: the fourth is to Proceed or to be Breathed out; and this belongs unto the Holy Spirit. The Five Notions are: the first, Inassibility; the second is to Beget; the third, to be Begotten; the fourth, *spiratio passiva*, to be Breathed out; the fifth, *spiratio activa*, or, to Breathe; and this Notion belongs to the Father and the Son alike; for *Pater et Filius*

spirant Spiritum Sanctum.[1]

"Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

---

1. This extract is from the "Golden Remains" of the Ever Memorable John Hales of Eton: London, 1673. He became professor of Greek in Oxford, 1612, and was present at the Synod of Dort. He went to that body a Calvinist, and left it an Arminian. He says himself: "At the well-pressing of John iii. 16, by Episcopius there, *I bid John Calvin good-night, as he has often told me.*" Bishop Pearson mentions him as a "man of as great a sharpness, quickness, and subtilty of wit as ever this or perhaps any nation bred; . . . a man of vast and illimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment."—T.↩

Book II. Christology and Objective Soteriology; or, the Doctrine of Christ and of His Salvation.

I. The Divinity of the Son of God.
II. The Incarnation.
III. The Atonement.

Article II.
Of the Word, or Son of God, Who Was Made Very Man.

161

The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

Introduction.

This article corresponds with Article II. of the Anglican Confession, save that Mr. Wesley substituted the third word "which" by "who," and omitted the clause "of her substance." In 1786 the clause was omitted, "begotten from everlasting of the Father." The title inadequately describes the contents of the article, which consists of three parts:

I. The Divinity of the Son, who is the Word of the Father;
II. His Incarnation;
III. His Atoning Sacrifice.

The article is in perfect agreement with the Three Creeds, and leads us to the discussion of soteriological questions of the highest moment.

Part I. The Divinity of the Son of God.

Chapter I. The Divine Sonship of Christ.

§ 1. The Relation Defined.

162
The supreme and essential Deity of Christ is affirmed in the first article; but before treating of his incarnation and atoning sacrifice, it is necessary to state more explicitly his divine nature and dignity. "Son of God" is his appropriate and descriptive designation. The First Person of the Trinity is here styled the Father, in his peculiar relation to the Son. The Supreme Being, without any reference to the personal distinctions in the Godhead, is called "Father," as he is the Originator of the world (Gen. ii. 4; Job xxxviii. 28), and especially of rational beings, as angels and men (Job xxxviii. 7; Heb. xii. 9; Mal. ii. 10; Acts xvii. 28; Luke iii. 38); and as he performs the part of a Father to his creatures in their conservation and care (Deut. xxxii. 6; Isa. xliv. 24; lxiii. 16; Matt. vi. 8, 9; vii. 9–11). But in the article he is called "the Father" in view of his relation to the Second Person of the Trinity—and "his Father" by eminence. His paternity in regard to the Son is always kept distinct from his paternity in regard to all others. Hence Jesus never says, "Our Father," though he teaches his disciples to say it—not including himself. *Cf.* John xx. 17. Now Christ is called the Son of God the Father, as he originated his human nature by the power of the Holy Ghost, without the intervention of a human father (Luke i. 35), and in a Messianic sense, as he was invested by him with regal dignity (John i. 49; x. 35, 36; *cf.* Ps. lxxxix. 26, 27); and because he begat him again from the dead and made him heir of all things (Acts xiii. 23, 33; Heb. i. 2, 5). But here he is called the Son of the Father in regard to his divine nature. Hence in the original article this clause is contained:

163
"Begotten from everlasting of the Father." Why this clause was omitted in the second edition of the Twenty-five Articles, 1786, and ever since, does not appear. Mr. Wesley held very firmly to the doctrine it contains, indorsing his brother Samuel's language:

From thee, through an eternal now,

Thy Son, thy offspring, flowed;
An everlasting Father, thou,
An everlasting God.

When Dr. Adam Clarke questioned this divine filiation, the British Conference made a deliverance upon it, and ordered that its rejection should be a bar to reception into the ministry. Richard Watson wrote largely, lucidly, and triumphantly in its defense, and so did other eminent men in the Wesleyan Connection. Scarcely any doctrine is more thoroughly and successfully elaborated in "Watson's Institutes," as it also is in "Pearson on the Creed."

§ 2. Pre-existence of the Son of God.

To set this doctrine forth in a clear light it is necessary to show that the Son of God had an existence before he was born of the virgin—that he existed from all eternity. The testimonies to this great truth are numerous and explicit. As might be expected, the Gospel of John abounds with them. See John i. 1–3, 14, 15; iii. 13, 16, 31; vi. 32–62; viii. 58; xvi. 28; xvii. 5, 24; 1 Cor. xv. 47; Eph. iv. 9; Col. i. 15–17; Heb. i. 2; ii. 14–16; 1 Pet. iii. 18–20.

It is fruitless to evade the force of these testimonies by saying that Christ existed before Abraham, for instance, in the divine purpose—every creature in the universe existed from all eternity in the divine purpose! It is as useless to say that the pre-existence of the Son of God refers to his humanity. His humanity, body and soul, originated in the womb of the virgin; how then could it have existed before he was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary? The epiphanies of the Son of God mentioned in the Old Testament were not real incarnations any more than were those of angels. If, like them, he assumed a human vehicle, or the semblance thereof, it does not follow that he had a real body and soul—a human nature—any more than that the angels, for the same reason, possessed it. The pre-existence which the Arians affirmed

of Christ was not of his human, but of a superangelic, nature. *They* knew, and admitted, that what he did before his incarnation cannot be predicated of humanity. A little reflection might have convinced them that it cannot be predicated of any other than God. He is

called the Angel Jehovah—the former term denoting his office and the latter his divine nature—the terms being in apposition. He is called a man simply because he appeared as such, as created angels frequently did, to communicate with men.

This does not prove the pre-existence of his human soul, a speculation ingeniously, elaborately, but unsuccessfully, defended by Dr. Watts, according to what is called the "Indwelling Scheme," to wit: that the soul of the Son of God was like a crystal globe, filled with the *Logos*, as a solar luminary—as if that could be the meaning of Colossians ii. 9! The pre-advent appearances of Christ no more prove the pre-existence of his soul than of his body, which all admit was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

Unite the foregoing testimonies with others that speak of the higher nature of Christ, and there can be no doubt that the Son is "the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father."

§ 3. The Son Bears the Names of God.

Christ bears the names and titles of God, and they are given to him in no secondary or figurative sense. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." (John i. 1–3.) "Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my God." (John xx. 28.) "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx. 28.) "God was manifest in the flesh." (1 Tim. iii. 16.) The common reading[1] in these two texts is well sustained,

and they settle the question of the Deity of the Son. *Cf.* Heb. i. 8; Rom. ix. 5; Tit. ii. 13; 1 John v. 20; and especially Isa. ix. 6, where he is called "the mighty God;" also Isa. vi. 5, with John xii. 41—from which it appears that the Jehovah of Isaiah's vision was the Jesus of the evangelist's narrative. *Cf.* Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Joel ii. 32 with Rom. x. 13; and Isa. xl. 3 with Matt. iii. 3. In these and other places the incommunicable name of Jehovah is given in an absolute sense to the Son of God.

§ 4. The Attributes of Deity Ascribed to the Son.

1. *Eternity.* "In the beginning was the Word"—that is, from eternity. The similar phrase in the Septuagint translation of Gen. i. 1 indicates that point in eternity when creation began; but the *Logos* was then existing, as he made the world. (John i. 1–3.) "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." (Col. i. 17.) He says: "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." (Rev. i. 11; xxii. 13.)

2. *Omnipotence.* "The Mighty God" (Isa. ix. 6); "The Almighty" (Rev. i. 8). *Cf.* Phil. iii. 21.

3. *Omnipresence.* Matt. xxiii. 20; xxviii. 20; John iii. 13. These passages assert that while his humanity is on earth or

in heaven, he is nevertheless in all places, which must be by his divine essence, as well as by the Holy Spirit. *Cf.* John xiv. 23.

4. *Omniscience.* John ii. 24, 25; xxi. 17; Col. ii. 3; Rev. ii. 23. These passages affirm that he knows all things—even the secret thoughts of all men—as he possesses all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

5. *Immutability.* Heb. i. 10–12—where the apostle applies to Christ the sublime language addressed by the Psalmist to the unchangeable and eternal Jehovah (Ps. cii. 25–27). In a word, all natural and moral excellences are attributed to him. "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." (Col. ii. 9; *cf.* John xvi. 15.)

§ 5. The Works of God Ascribed to the Son.

He created the universe. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." (John i. 10.) "God created all things by Jesus Christ." (Eph. iii. 9.) "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him." (Col. i. 16.) "By whom also he made the worlds." (Heb. i. 2–10.) Some argue from this that the Son was an inferior being—the Arian hypothesis—and as such was employed by the Father to

create the universe, being delegated to and qualified for that work. But can omnipotence, and omniscience, and omnipresence, all of which were required for the creation of the universe, be delegated to a creature, however exalted? There is absolutely no way of explaining these passages except by recognizing the unity of the Son with the Father, as to nature, and this distinction from him as to personality. Creation is the work of the Triune God, but the agency of the Son is made prominent, because of the conspicuous part which he bears in the redemption of men whom he created. "He that built all things is God." (Heb. iii. 4.) The conservation and government of the universe are also ascribed to the Son. "He is Lord of all." (Acts x. 36.) "By him all things consist." (Col. i. 17.) "Upholding all things by the word of his power." (Heb. i. 3.)

The prerogatives invested in him as Messiah (Matt. xxviii. 18; Luke x. 22; John iii, 35; xvii. 2; Rom. xiv. 9; Eph. i. 22; Rev. xvii. 14) could not have been conferred on him by the Father and wielded by him, if he were not divine as well as human.

167

He forgives sins (Matt. ix. 2–7; Mark ii. 5–12; Col. iii. 17; Jude 21), and "who can forgive sins but God only?" He will raise the dead, judge the world, and accomplish the restitution of all things. (John v. 22–29; Matt. xxv. 31, 32; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; Rom. xiv. 10; Phil. iii. 20, 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Heb. i. 12; Rev. xxi. 5.)

§ 6. The Son Receives Divine Worship.

New Testament saints are distinguished as those "that call on his name." (Acts ix. 14, 21; 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 12–14) The very word [ἐπικαλέω] is used for the invocation of Jehovah in the Old Testament. (1 Sam. xix. 17, 18, LXX. *et al.*; *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 17.) This invocation of Christ is divine worship. The New Testament abounds with examples of religious worship paid to Christ after his ascension, showing that it was not the civil respect shown to superiors. (Acts i. 24; vii. 59, 60; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9; 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17; 1 Tim. i. 2; Rev. i. 5.)

The term προσκυνέω which is employed for the worship of God, is used for the worship of Christ. It is, indeed, sometimes employed for civil salutation, as the English word *worship* is so used. In the New Testament it is said to be used sixty-one times: in

twenty-two cases it is used of worship offered to God the Father, or absolutely to God; five of divine worship intransitively; fifteen of worship to Jesus Christ; seventeen of idolatrous worship condemned; and two of human salutation. Of these two, in one (Matt. xviii. 29) the king to whom the worship is paid is a type of God. We are therefore virtually reduced to one solitary instance (Acts x. 25) [in which this term indicates the deference or homage paid to a human superior, and in this Peter did not suffer the act of Cornelius to pass unrebuked].

But all idea of mere civil respect vanishes when the worship is paid to Christ by angels (Heb. i. 6; Rev. v. 11, 12); and by every other creature in the universe (Phil. ii. 9–11; Rev. v. 13, 14). Are all the holy beings in the universe idolaters? for they certainly honor the Son even as they honor the Father.

§ 7. The Impregnable Conclusion.

Socinians and deists speak of Jesus Christ as a man of consummate moral excellence; but if he is not God as well as man, he is the most consummate impostor in history. He is either God, as he claims to be, and allows himself to be considered, or he is the greatest knave or the most insane fanatic that ever

lived. The deniers of our Lord's divinity may take which horn of the dilemma they please. The writers of the New Testament are usually considered sensible men, whether inspired or not; but they write like idiots if Christ be a mere man, since they associate him with the Father and the Holy Spirit, as of equal rank and dignity. The first converts to Christianity realized the divinity of Christ; and the writings of the Fathers abound with testimonies to this point.

It is vain to oppose this doctrine by adducing passages which speak of Christ as man, as inferior to the Father, and the like. For, as the Athanasian Creed expresses it, he is "equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood." But there is another solution of such passages as John xiv. 28: "For my Father is greater than I." As this is assigned as a reason why the disciples should rejoice at his going to the Father, it seems to refer to the more exalted and more glorious state of the Father in heaven. (John xvii. 5.) The glory of the metropolis

exceeds that of a remote province of the empire. (Eph. i. 20–23; Phil. ii. 5–11; Heb. i. 2, 3; ii. 9.) Whether or not this reason comprehends the advantages which the disciples would realize from his exaltation, it is certain that it would inure to their benefit, and therefore was a cause of rejoicing on their part. That Jesus is "equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood," is true, but not pertinent in this place. That, as begotten in his divine nature, he is subordinate to the Father, by whom he was eternally begotten, and who himself is unbegotten, may be also true, but it is also impertinent in this place. That Christ is in all respects inferior to the Father, is neither true nor pertinent. That he is inferior to the Father, in that his divinity is united with humanity, is not absolutely true, but it is true in view of his humiliation on the earth; but that inferiority ceased when his humanity was glorified and exalted to heaven. Calvin well says: "Christ does not here compare the Godhead of his Father with his own, nor his human nature with the divine essence of the Father; but rather his present condition with that heavenly glory into which he was soon to be received." Μείζων—"greater"—in this place, therefore means *beatior*—a more glorious state. So Storr and Bengel interpret the passage.

---

1. In Acts xx. 28 the question is, Shall we read "the Church of God" (τοῦ Θεοῦ), or "the Church of the Lord" (τοῦ κυρίου), "which he purchased with his own blood?" The reading "Church of God" is retained by Alford, after having once given his judgment against it, by Westcott and Hort, by Tregelles in the margin, and by the Revised Version, which, however, places in its margin "many ancient authorities read *the Lord*." The reading "Church of the Lord" is preferred by Lachmann, Meyer, and Tischendorf, though the received reading is supported by the two great uncials, *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*. Without further citing the evidence from MSS., versions, and fathers, we may adopt Scrivener's conclusion that "internal evidence will decide the critic's choice where authorities are so much divided as here." The internal evidence for τοῦ Θεοῦ seems decisive: (1) the expression "Church of the Lord" never occurs in the Pauline Epistles, while "Church of God" occurs eleven times; (2) the well-known principle, "the more difficult the reading the more likely it is to be genuine," decides for τοῦ Θεοῦ, "undoubtedly," as

Scrivener remarks, “the harder form”—harder, not grammatically, but theologically. Westcott and Hort print the passage as a quotation from Ps. lxxiv. 2: “Remember thy congregation, which thou hast purchased of old.”

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, “God was manifest in the flesh,” Westcott and Hort, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and critics and editors generally, substitute “Who,” (ὅς), for “God;” the Revised Version translates “He who,” etc., and appends this note, “The word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*.” The construction with “who” is very difficult, its antecedent being omitted—and this, according to the principle noticed above, favors the reading—but, “according to the purport of the various clauses,” says Meyer, “it can be none other than Christ. This curious omission may be thus accounted for; the sentence has been taken from a formula of confession, or better, from an old Christian hymn, as its metrical and euphonious character seems to indicate.” The term ὁμολογουμένως, “confessedly” (translated in our version, “without controversy”), might possibly be viewed as pointing in the direction of this confessional origin.—T.↩

Chapter II. Christ the Word and the Only-Begotten.

§ 1. The Logos.

169

It is worthy of note that John, who says so much about the Divine Sonship of Christ, is the only sacred writer who calls him "the Word." It is used only in John i. 1, 14; 1 John i. 1 (1 John v. 7 being rejected as spurious); Rev. xix. 13. *Logos* means both *ratio* and *oratio*, reason and speech. It seems to be applied to Christ in both senses—the former ontological, denoting his relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit; and the latter economical, denoting his relation to the world, as the Divine Oracle revealing the will of God to man.

The term was familiar to the Jews of that ago, as it had been used, like the *Memrah* of the Targumists, as a personification of God's speech to man, or a periphrase for Jehovah himself. (Gen. xv. 1; Wis. xviii. 15.[1]) It is thus frequently used by Philo, who sometimes, like Plato, seems to use it in a personal sense, as if it designated a second divine hypostasis, but is uncertain and inconsistent. John uses it in a distinctively personal sense, as designating the pre-existent nature of him who became incarnate to reveal the will of God to man, thus opposing the Platonic and Oriental notions of the *Logos*, which were in danger of corrupting the doctrine of the Church. He says, "the Word was with God:" that expresses his distinct personality; yet he adds, "and the Word was God," lest the former clause should be construed as denoting an essential and not a mere personal distinction. It is properly rendered, as *Logos* has the article, showing that it is the subject of the proposition, "the Word was God." He adds, "The same was in the beginning with God." The repetition emphasizes the distinct personality of the *Logos* in view of what is about to be affirmed of him—viz., that he created the universe, and was the Source of life and light to the

170

world, and especially that he became incarnate: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." That

is, he became man. “Flesh” (“flesh and blood,” Heb. ii. 14) designates humanity as possessing a physical nature. (2 Cor. xiii. 4; Heb. v. 7.) This opposes the error of the *Docetae*, who denied that Christ possessed a real body (1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John 7), without favoring the notion of the Apollinarians, that he did not possess a human spirit, any more than “flesh” in Luke iii. 6; John xvii. 2; Acts ii. 17 implies that men have no souls. (Mark xiv. 34; Luke ii. 52; xxiii. 46.) By this incarnation the *Logos* is so united with the humanity of Jesus as to constitute one person, without confusion of the divine and human natures. The word *flesh* is used probably to note more distinctly the wonderful humiliation which the incarnation involves. John says he “dwelt among us”—literally *tabernacled*—he really made his abode upon earth, though as a sojourner. *Cf.* Lev. xxvi. 11, 12; Ezek. xxxvii. 27; xliii. 7, LXX.; Ecclus. xxiv. 8–10. But as in these passages there is a reference to the Jewish tabernacle, in which the *shekinah*, or symbol of the Divine Presence, dwelt; and as the Hebrew word has nearly the form, as well as the same meaning, of σκηνή, one can hardly help thinking that the evangelist had this in his mind, and that this suggested the next clause, or was suggested by it: “And we beheld his glory”—as it shone through the tabernacle—the manifestation of his divinity (Heb. i. 3) in the miracles which he wrought (John ii. 11), in the visible splendor which shone from him in his transfiguration (Luke ix. 32), and in the “grace and truth” which made his character and life illustrious. The divinity dwelt symbolically in the Jewish tabernacle and temple (Ps. lxxx. 1); it dwells influentially in the tabernacle or temple of the Church composed of true believers; but it dwells substantially in the humanity of Jesus. (Col. ii. 9.) By saying he “dwelt among us”—man with men, flesh with flesh (Heb. ii. 14)—and “we beheld his glory,” the evangelist emphasizes the reality of the incarnation, and his certain knowledge of the fact. (Acts i. 21; 2 Pet. i. 16–18; 1 John i. 1–3.) That glory, he says, is “the glory”—or rather *a glory*—“as of the only begotten of the Father:” not “as if,” or merely “like;” but such as belongs to him. *Cf.* Matt. vii. 29; 1 Cor. v. 3 for the idiom.

§ 2. The Only-begotten.

Μονογενής—only begotten—*sc.*, Son—is applied to Christ by John alone. (John i. 14–18; iii. 16–18; 1 John iv. 9.) In the eternal generation of his divinity, and in the miraculous generation of his humanity, he is absolutely alone (Mark xii. 6): those who believe in him are through him made, in an infinitely subordinate sense, the children of God. (John i. 12, 13; Rom. viii. 29.) He is the only begotten Son of the Father, or *from* the Father, implying the divine generation. Thus the Word, as a title of Christ, agrees precisely with the Son, that other distinctive title: and both are used of him in an ontological and also an economical sense. Parkhurst, on μονογενής refers it "strictly and properly to his humanity," as no other man was begotten as he was. (Luke i. 35.). But, says Rose, "Parkhurst gives no reason for departing from Bishop Bull, etc., except the fact of our Saviour's miraculous birth; nor does the sense which he has substituted agree as well with the passages in which the word occurs."

§ 3. Bishop Pearson's Summary.

After an elaborate exposition of the passages—particularly in John—which prove the pre-existence of Christ, Bishop Pearson says:

I conclude from the undeniable testimony of St. John that at the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of argument, as the apostle antecedently by the method of nature, that in the beginning Christ was. He then who was in heaven, and descended from thence before that which was begotten of the virgin ascended thither; he who was before John the Baptist, and before Abraham; he who was at the end of the first world and at the beginning of the same—he had a real being and existence before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary. But all these, we have already shown, belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge that Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost, which is our first assertion, properly opposed to the Photinians.

Following a masterly treatment of many of those scriptures which impregnably establish the essential Deity of Christ, Bishop Pearson says:

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; he whose glory Esaias saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled Alpha and Omega, without any restriction or limitation; he

who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those ways by which the Supreme Deity is expressed; he had a being before Christ was conceived

172

by the Virgin Mary, and the being which he had was the one eternal and indivisible divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. But all these are certainly true of him in whom we believed, Jesus Christ, as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred Scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the virgin was not any created, but the divine essence; nor was he any creature, but the true eternal God: which was our second assertion, particularly opposed to the Arian heresy.

§ 4. The Unigeniture of Christ.

The article does not repudiate the economical sense of the titles Son and Word, though they are used here in the ontological sense—that is to say, before he became the Son of God by his miraculous birth of the Virgin, he was the Son of God in a far higher sense, as he was consubstantial with the Father from all eternity—"begotten from everlasting of the Father." He was thus his necessary, natural, proper, and only Son. (John v. 18; Rom. viii. 32.) This unigeniture excludes all other filiations. "The divine essence," says Pearson, "was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son." All other filiations are metaphorical: this is real, substantial, natural. In human generation there is

derivation, or decision, of part of the substance of the parent; but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal; whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself; for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality wholly to be removed, when we speak of Him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being always Father, as

always God. Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolifical; in God eternal perfection showeth his eternal fecundity. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same [numerical] essence; the power of generation depending on the first prolifical benediction, 'increase and multiply,' it must be made by way of multiplication, and thus every son becomes another man. But the divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which proceedeth by the communication hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God: Abraham man, and Isaac man—but Abraham one man,

173

Isaac another man: not so the Father one God, and the Word another; hut the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the Son unto the Father, by reason of the same which he received from him; being the full, perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generations: it followeth that this communication of the divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is, and is called, the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of St. Peter's confession, "Thou art the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 69); this the ground of our Saviour's distinction. "I ascend unto my Father and your Father" (John xx. 17). Hence did St. John raise a verity, more than only a negation of falsity, when he said we "are in the true Son" (1 John v. 20); for we which are in him are true, not false sons, but such sons we are not as the "true Son." Hence did St. Paul draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that "he spared not his own *proper* Son." (Rom. viii. 32.) Thus have we sufficiently shown that the eternal communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word was a proper generation by which Christ Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God.

This luminous exposition of Bishop Pearson agrees precisely with the Constantinopolitan Creed: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made."

Here the divine filiation is shown to consist in the communication of the divine essence by the First Person of the Trinity to the Second—so that the First is properly called Father,

and the Second is properly called Son—and in that sense the latter is μονογενής, *unigenitus*, only-begotten—which does not, as Socinians say, mean simply well-beloved, but only-begotten, as a divine Son, in the natural, proper, and not metaphorical sense, in which Isaac was called the only begotten son of Abraham. The Son of God is consubstantial with the Father—ὁμοούσιος, of the same substance, not ὁμοιούσιος, of a like substance, as the Arians expressed it. The essence is absolutely the same.

§ 5. Why Is Christ Said To Be Begotten?

But it is asked, Why is the Second Person of the Trinity said to be *generated* by the First Person, while the Third Person, who is precisely of the same nature, is said to *proceed* from the Father and the Son? Donne says: "When Gregory Nazianzen was pressed by one to assign a difference between those words *begotten* and *proceeding*, *Dic tu mihi*, says he, *quid sit generatio, et ego dicam tibi, quid sit processio, ut ambo insaniamus*

174

: Do thou tell me what this *begetting* is, and then I will tell thee what this proceeding is; and all the world will find us both mad for going about to express inexpressible things." (Ser. xi.)

Bishop Burnet declines any attempt to solve this mystery. He says:

> Begetting is a term that naturally signifies the relation between the Father and the Son; but what it strictly signifies here is not possible for us to understand till we comprehend this whole matter; nor can we be able to assign a reason why the emanation of the Son, and not of the Holy Ghost likewise, is called *begetting*). In this we use the Scripture terms, but must confess we cannot frame a distant comprehension of that which is so far above us. This *begetting* was from all eternity; if it had been in time the Son and Holy Ghost must have been creatures; but, if they are truly God, they must be eternal, and not produced by having a being given them, but educed of a substance that was eternal, and from which they did eternally spring.

There is a modesty in this which we might well imitate; nevertheless we may, without temerity, suggest that, as some terms were needed to express the personal relations of the Godhead, Father, Son, and Spirit, begetting, filiation, and proceeding, will

answer as well as any—better than any other; for Father and Son, paternity and filiation are singularly adapted to express the ontological relation between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity, especially in view of their economical relations, which are more obviously those of paternity and filiation. Then what word can be more suitable than procession as referring to the relation of the Spirit to the Father and the Son? Procession, indeed, might be used of the Second Person, for filiation is a procession; but every procession is not a filiation; and as the Spirit proceedeth from both the Father and the Son, both ontologically and economically, the words begetting and filiation would not do to express the relation of the Third Person to the First and Second Persons of the Godhead. No one would think of speaking of the First Person as the Son, and, for the reason assigned, that title could hardly be given to the Holy Spirit. Bishop Pearson says:

> But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons, yet one person we know, to whom the divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the Third Person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the divine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by

> receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the only Son? To this I answer that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word; but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession; and though every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet everything which proceedeth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the Son, but the Gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth, proceeding from the same person in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; Eve descending not from Adam as Seth did, by way of generation—that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him; the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the

first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the regeneration and adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost, doth no way prejudice the eternal generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God. Seeing, then, our Saviour Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible divine essence; seeing that he had not that divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation, we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God; and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any, we must also acknowledge him the *only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost as Son, from the adopted children as the natural Son.

Though the learned prelate does not assign a reason for the distinction between filiation and procession, yet the proofs of the doctrine and the analysis which he adduces in its illustration are quite satisfactory. One might as well object to the use of the terms creation and generation as to object to the terms generation and procession. We look in vain for any perfect parallels or illustrations in nature, as there are none of the Trinity in Unity. We are indeed referred to the sun, which no sooner than it was created gave forth light and heat; so that there cannot be a sun without these properties; and if the sun had been eternal it would have eternally radiated light and sent forth heat: it is its nature so to do. The Father never began to be, so the Son and Spirit never began to be.[2] He is an everlasting

Father, as he is an everlasting God. It is natural for a fountain to send forth a stream; it could not be a fountain were it not to do so; the moment it became a fountain the stream issued from it. The Father is

> The Fountain of the Godhead owned,
> And foremost of the Three.

That fountain existed without any beginning, and the two streams issued from it from all eternity. We repeat:

> From thee, through an eternal now,
> Thy Son, thy offspring, flowed;
> An everlasting Father thou.
> An everlasting God.

The Sonship of Christ therefore implies no posteriority in time nor inferiority in nature. It is an eternal generation, for the Son is not a voluntary, but a natural and necessary, offspring of the divine fecundity. He could not be God without being a Father, and he could not be a Father without having a Son. As the son of a man is a man, possessing all the attributes of his father, so the Son of God, in the proper, natural sense of the filiation, must be God, possessing all the attributes of his Father, very and eternal God. The title Son of God is, indeed, by the Synoptic Evangelists, sometimes used for the human or the Messianic character of Jesus, as distinct from his essential Deity, just as the title Son of Man is used with predicates which belong to his divine nature; but generally, as in the Gospel and Epistles of John, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews—which treats so largely of the divinity of Christ—the title Son of God expresses his higher, divine filiation.

§ 6. Importance of This Doctrine.

It has been acutely observed by Mr. Treffry, who writes admirably on the Eternal Sonship, that its denial

> destroys all relation among the Persons of the Godhead; for no other relations among the hypostases are mentioned in Scripture, save those which are expressed by paternity, filiation, and procession. Every other relation is merely economical; and these natural relations being removed, Ave must then conceive of the Persons in the Godhead as perfectly independent of each other—a view which has a strong tendency to endanger the unity of the essence. If Son of God be in strictness
>
> 177
>
> a human designation (and so it must be if it relate not to his divinity), then we may say that our Saviour, as God, has no distinctive name at all in the whole Scriptures. The title "God" does not distinguish him from the other Persons of the Trinity; and "Word" stands in precisely the same predicament as "Son," for the same kind of criticism may reduce it to merely an official appellation. The other names of Christ are all official; and hence the denial of the title "Son" as a designation of Divinity leads to the remarkable conclusion that we have not in Scripture a single appellation which, in strictness and truth of speech, can be used to express the Divine Person of him who was made flesh and dwelt among us.

As his Sonship is divine, we can have no scruple in honoring the Son even as we honor the Father. We run no risk of idolatry;

For all the plenitude divine
Resides in the eternal Son.

As his Sonship is divine, we can see the grandeur of our redemption, the evil of sin from which we are redeemed, and the obligations of gratitude under which we are laid, seeing that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." (1 John iv. 9.) It leads us to hope for every thing from him which may be requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul, for time and for eternity. "He that spared not his own Son"—"his own proper Son," his "one Son, his well-beloved" (Mark xii. 6)—"but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. viii. 32).

---

1. "Thine almighty Word leaped down from heaven, out of thy royal throne, as a fierce man of war into the midst of a land of destruction."↩
2. Donne says: "This is that Father that hath a Son, and yet is no older than that Son, for he is *a Patre*, but not *post Patrem* (Nazianzen), but so from the Father, as he is not after the Father: he hath from him *principium originale*, but not *initiale*, a root from whence he sprung, but no spring-time, when he sprung out of that root."↩

Part II. The Incarnation of the Son of God.

Chapter I. The Humanity of Christ.

§ 1. Creed Statements Concerning the Incarnation.

178
The article states that “the Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man.”

This is explicitly stated in the three Creeds. Thus the Apostles’ Creed: “And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.” So the Nicene Creed: “Who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man.” So the Athanasian Creed: “For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man: God of the substance of the Father, begotten before all worlds, and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the father, as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood; who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God: one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person; for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.”

§ 2. The Humanity of Christ Stated and Proved.

That Christ is “very God” has been fully proved. That he is “very man” is equally evident. He was born with our nature,

179
only he did not inherit the sin of our nature. He was “conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary,” and therefore was

"holy"—absolutely free from sin. "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," therefore "he was the seed of the woman." *Cf.* Gen. iii. 15; Gal. iv. 4. That woman was "of the house and lineage of David," therefore he "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3); and as David was a descendant of Abraham, the apostle says "he took on him the seed of Abraham" (Heb. ii. 16). He was just as truly Mary's child—formed of her substance—as if he had had a human father, only the divine agency in his production precluded the transmission of our hereditary depravity. He was a perfect man; as our article expresses it, he "took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures —that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried." The language of the article is so explicit because it is directed against the *Docetae*, who said that he possessed a human nature only in appearance, and not in reality—so that all his life, works, sufferings, death, resurrection, etc., were but a phantasm—hence they were called *Phantasiastae*. The Eutychians came near this heresy in maintaining that the humanity of Christ was absorbed into his divinity, leaving him but one nature, and that the divine. So the Apollinarians, who held, indeed, that he possessed a human body, but not a human spirit—the divinity supplying its place. Watson, in his "Institutes," Part II., Chap. XVI., well sets forth the humanity of Christ.

§ 3. Liddon on Our Lord's Humanity.

Liddon, in his Bampton Lectures on "The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," devotes a considerable space to a proof of his "very manhood"—his true humanity. We quote two or three paragraphs:

> The great Subject of the gospel narratives has a true human body. He is conceived in the womb of a human mother. He is by her brought forth into the world; he is fed at her breast during infancy. As an infant he is made to undergo the painful rite of circumcision. He is a babe in swaddling clothes lying in a manger. He is nursed in the arms of the aged Simeon. His bodily growth is traced up to his attaining the age of twelve, and from that point to manhood. His presence at the marriage-feast in Cana, at the great

entertainment in the

house of Levi, and at the table of Simon the Pharisee; the supper which he shared at Bethany with the friend whom he had raised from the grave, the Paschal festival which he desired so earnestly to eat before he suffered, the bread and fish of which he partook before the eyes of his disciples in the early dawn on the shore of the Lake of Galilee, even after his resurrection—are witnesses that he came like one of ourselves, "eating and drinking." When he is recorded to have taken no food during the forty days of the temptation, this implies the contrast presented by his ordinary habit. Indeed, he seemed to the men of his day more dependent upon the physical supports of life than the great ascetic who had preceded him. He knew by experience what are the pangs of hunger, after the forty days' fast in the wilderness, and in a lesser degree, as may be supposed, when walking into Jerusalem on the Monday before his passion. The profound spiritual sense of his redemptive cry, "I thirst," uttered while he was hanging on the cross, is not obscured when its primary literal meaning, that while dying he actually endured that well-nigh sharpest form of bodily suffering, is explicitly recognized. His deep sleep on the Sea of Galilee in a little bark which the waves threatened momentarily to ingulf, and his sitting down at the well of Jacob, through great exhaustion produced by a long journey on foot from Judea, proved that he was subject at times to the depression of extreme fatigue. And, not to dwell at length upon those particular references to the several parts of his bodily frame which occur in Holy Scripture, it is obvious to note that the evangelical account of his physical sufferings, of his death, of his burial, and of the wounds in his hands and feet and side after his resurrection, are so many emphatic attestations to the fact of his true and full participation in the material side of our common nature.

Equally explicit and vivid is the witness which Scripture affords to the true human soul of our blessed Lord. Its general movements are not less spontaneous, nor do its affections flow less freely, because no sinful impulse finds a place in it, and each pulse of its moral and mental life is in conscious harmony with, and subjection to, an all-holy Will. Jesus rejoices in spirit on hearing of the spread of the kingdom of heaven among the simple and the poor; he beholds the young ruler, and forthwith loves him. He loves Martha and her sister and Lazarus with a common, yet, as seems to be implied, with a discriminating affection. His eye on one occasion betrays a sudden movement of deliberate anger at the hardness of heart which could steel itself against truth by maintaining a dogged silence. The scattered and fainting multitude melts him to compassion; he sheds tears of sorrow at the grave of Lazarus, and at the sight of the city which has rejected his love. In contemplating his approaching passion, and the ingratitude of the traitor apostle, his soul is shaken by a vehement agitation

which he does not conceal from his disciples. In the garden of Gethsemane he wills to enter into an agony of amazement and dejection. His mental sufferings are so keen and piercing that his tender frame gives way beneath the trial, and he sheds his blood before they nail him to the cross. His human will consciously submits itself to a higher will, and he learns obedience by the discipline of pain. He carries his dependence still further: he is habitually subject to his parents; he recognizes the fiscal regulations of a pagan State; he places himself in the hands of his enemies; he is crucified through weakness. If an apostle teaches that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in him, an evangelist records that he increases in wisdom

as he increases in stature. Conformably with these representations, we find him a man expressing creaturely dependence upon God by prayer. He rises up a great while before day at Capernaum, and departs into a solitary place, that he may spend the hours in uninterrupted devotion. He offers to heaven strong crying with tears in Gethsemane; he intercedes majestically for his whole redeemed Church in the Paschal supper-room; he asks pardon for his Jewish and Gentile murderers at the very moment of his crucifixion; he resigns his departing spirit into his Father's hands.

Thus, as one apostle teaches, he took a body of flesh, and his whole humanity, both of soul and body, shared in the sinless infirmities which belong to our common nature. To deny this fundamental truth, "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," is, in the judgment of another apostle, the mark of the deceiver, of the antichrist. Nor do the prerogatives of our Lord's manhood destroy its perfection and reality, although they do undoubtedly invest it with a robe of mystery, which faith must acknowledge, but which she cannot hope to penetrate. Christ's manhood is not unreal because it is impersonal; because in him the place of any created individuality at the root of thought and feeling and will is supplied by the person of the Paternal Word, who has wrapped around his being a created nature, through which, in its unmutilated perfection, he acts upon humankind. Christ's manhood is not unreal because it is sinless; because the entail of any taint of transmitted sin is in him cut off by a supernatural birth of a virgin mother; and because his whole life of thought, feeling, will, and action is in unfaltering harmony with the law of absolute truth. Nor is the reality of his manhood impaired by any exceptional beauty, whether of outward form or of mental endowment, such as might become one "fairer than the children of men," and taking precedence of them in all things; since in him our nature does but resume its true and typical excellence as the crowning glory of the visible creation of God.

Chapter II. Of One Person and Two Natures in Christ.

§ 1. Nestorianism and Eutychianism.

182

It is of immense importance to have clear views of the person and natures of our blessed Lord. We say *natures*—in the plural—and *person*—in the singular, and thus keep the *via media* between the so-called heresy of Nestorianism, which was condemned by the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), and which held a *personal duality* in Christ, and the so-called heresy of Eutychianism, which was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and which held a *unity of nature* in Christ.

It seems difficult to define Nestorianism, or to conceive how there could be two persons in Christ. There is, indeed, a kind of Nestorianism which teaches that when the mediatorial kingdom shall be delivered up to the Father by the Son, his humanity will be separated from his divinity, and exist apart from it to all eternity. But this is so unscriptural that we doubt if there are a hundred people in the world that believe it. The ancient Nestorians never dreamed of any thing so unfounded, nor do their descendants at the present day.

The Eutychian, or Monophysite, heresy—sometimes called Jacobite from its great defender, Jacobus of Syria (A.D. 530)—was subjected to various modifications, and it led to very absurd consequences, as the error of the Monothelites, that there is but one will in Christ, and that of the Theopaschites, that the divine nature suffered.

§ 2. Heresies Consequent upon Eutychianism.

On this subject we quote a curious passage from Brerewood's "Inquiries Touching the Diversity of Languages and Religions," printed in 1622:

> This heresy of the Monothelites, springing out of that bitter root of the Jacobites, touching one only nature in Christ, was the last of that long and

wicked train of heresies which, upon the contempt of the Council of Chalcedon, exceedingly wasted and ruined the East Church; for after that the detestation of Nestorius's heresy, touching two persons in our Saviour (condemned in the third General

Council), had so immoderately distempered the phantasies of Eutiches in Constantinople, and of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscorus, with their other adherents, that they thought not themselves safe enough from the heresy of two persons till they were fallen into the other and opposite extremity of one nature in Christ, the divine and human natures in Christ (in their conceits) by permixtion and confusion of substances, and of properties, growing into one, upon their adunation; and withal, that the human nature of Christ was not consubstantial to ours, but of another kind and condition, which phantasies the fourth General Council condemned. After, I say, this heresy of Eutiches and Dioscorus had grown to that head in Egypt and Syria that, like to a violent and furious stream whose course would not be staid, it bare down before it all oppositions, and, among the rest, that great and reverend Council of Chalcedon, that had condemned it, and was condemned by it, it gave occasion for an infinite train of heresies to follow at the breach which it had made. For, first (to omit infinite extravagant branches that sprung from it, and infinitely deform the Church, renting with many schisms the unity, and with as many heresies wounding the faith, of it), it drew after it the heresy of the passibleness of the Deity, because the deity of Christ was become (in their conceits) the same nature with the humanity that was passible. Secondly (the absurdity of that being discerned), it occasioned another extremely opposite, namely, of the impassibility of the humanity of our Saviour (but on the same ground), because, namely, it was become one nature with the Deity, which now we know to be impassible. Thirdly, when the fondness of both was discovered, it bred a new device, touching one nature in our Saviour (as the wit of heretics will better serve them to devise a thousand shifts to delude the truth, than their pride will suffer them once to yield and acknowledge it). It bred, I say, a new device, namely, to be one, not by permixtion or confusion of substances, as Eutiches first taught, but only by composition, the Deity and humanity, by coalition, becoming one nature in Christ, as the body and soul grow into one nature in man. And fourthly, when this phantasy began also somewhat to rebate and relent in many, yet still a fraction, as it were, or rather a consequent of it, was retained (for, indeed, it implieth by necessary consequence the unity of nature), namely, that there was but one will and one action of both natures in the person of our Saviour. And God knows what a train and succession of heresies might have followed these, if that Lord whom they had infinitely wronged by their wanton and wandering conceits of him had not, to stop the course of their stream of wickedness and folly, brought on them the Saracens of

Arabia.

§ 3. The Theopaschite Heresy.

The Fathers were greatly opposed to the Theopaschite heresy.[1]

184

The orthodox laid down, as axiomatic, the impassibility of the divine nature. But as Christ did really suffer, if he had but one nature, and that the divine, then the divinity must have suffered; and this they considered a *reductio ad absurdum*.

On the other hand, if the divinity were absorbed by the humanity, or resolved into it, then Christ was merely a human being, and his sufferings would have no atoning merit.

Dr. Dwight says:

> It will not be supposed, as plainly it cannot, that Christ suffered in his divine nature. Nor will it be believed that any created nature could, in that short space of time, suffer what would be equivalent to even a slight distress extended through eternity. The atonement of Christ, great as his distresses were, did not derive its value principally from the degree in which he experienced them, but from the infinite greatness and excellency of his character. Although the divine nature is necessarily unsuffering, yet in this case it exactly coincided in its dictates with all the conduct of the created mind of Christ, and lent to that conduct its own infinite weight and worth.

Dr. Ralston, in his "Elements of Divinity" (I. 3. 18), says: "The value and efficacy of his atonement result mainly, not from the intensity of his sufferings, but the dignity of his character. It was the humanity, and not the divinity, which suffered. The humanity was the sacrifice, but the divinity was the altar on which it was offered, and by which the gift was sanctified. The sufferings were finite in their extent, but the sacrifice was of infinite value, by reason of the mysterious hypostatic union with the divinity." He cites from Dr. Dick: "His sufferings were limited in degree, because the nature in which he endured them was finite, but their merit was infinite, because the suffering nature was united to the Son of God."

§ 4. Bishop Pearson's View.

But in further development of this point, we beg permission to copy a few paragraphs from one of the great masters, advising those who can procure the work, and can avail themselves of the learned notes which corroborate the text, to do so. Bishop

Pearson, in his immortal Exposition of the Creed, speaking of the sufferings of Christ, says:

While we prove the person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the perfection of the Godhead is incapable. The divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore, while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion as to deny that the divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore, as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering.

Whereas then the humanity of *Christ* consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as "the Word was made flesh" (John i. 14), though the Word was never made (as being in the beginning God), but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh: so saith St. Peter, "Christ suffered for us in the flesh" (1 Pet. iv. 1), in that nature of man which he took upon him: and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. For he was "put to death in the flesh; but quickened in the spirit" (1 Pet. iii. 18); suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As he "was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3), in the language of St. Paul, so was he "put to death in the flesh," in the language of St. Peter; and as he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness" (Rom. i. 4), so was he "quickened by the Spirit." Thus the proper subject and recipient of our Saviour's passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

Far be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could suffer—which only hath immortality, could die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity; nor can that infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsical and essential perfections. If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate

into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves, how can that spiritual essence contrast the least infirmity by any union with humanity? We must neither harbor so low an estimation of the divine nature as to conceive it capable of any diminution, nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with another. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian heretics, whom the Church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion—that all the sufferings of our Mediator were subjected in his human nature.

And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the person suffering, with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit

an easy solution if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For thereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other; and that upon good reason. For being the same individual person is, by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *A man is God*; because in this particular he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the human nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by virtue of the same incarnation it is also proper to say *A man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge that all the essential attributes of the divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God, to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the human nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible and mortal, so God the Son did truly suffer and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties.

Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the divinity of Christ were passible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence and omnipresence; but because the

same God the Son was also the Son of man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal: mortal as the Son of man, in respect of his humanity; eternal as the Son of God, in respect of his divinity. The sufferings, therefore, of the *Messias* were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the human nature was conjoined to the divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God; yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions —Who it was that suffered; in respect of his office, the *Messias*, in respect of his person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, but in his humanity, which he assumed, clothed with our infirmities.

This disposes of the objection that if the divine nature did not suffer, there could be no atoning value in the sufferings of Christ. Richard Watson says: "To another objection of Socinus, that because the divinity itself suffers not, therefore it does not enter into this consideration of punishment, Grotius well replies:

187

'This is as much as to say that it is an offense of the same kind whether you strike a private person or a king, a stranger or a father, because blows are directed against the body, not against the dignity or relationship.'"

§ 5. The Self-emptying.

The impassibility of the divine nature of Christ is perfectly compatible with his assumption of the human nature. In this stupendous event no change passed upon the Godhead, like that which some Germans designate by the term *kenosis*, borrowed from Phil. ii. 7, "But made himself of no reputation"—ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν—literally, "but emptied himself," as Charles Wesley sings:

He left his Father's throne above
(So free, so infinite his grace),

Emptied himself of all but love,
And bled for Adam's helpless race.

Compare John xiv. 28, "My Father is greater than I," and 2 Cor. viii. 9, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

But this idea of the *kenosis* has been carried to an unwarrantable extent. It is unscriptural to suppose that there was a literal *undeifiying* of the eternal *Logos* when he became incarnate. He never ceased to be one with the Father and the Holy Spirit in all the essential divine perfections, though for economical purposes, as personally distinct from the Father and the Spirit, he permitted his glory to undergo an eclipse—such an obscuration as attracted the wondering gaze of the universe of moral and intelligent beings.

Veiled in flesh the Godhead see,
Hail th' incarnate Deity!
Pleased as man with men t' appear,
Jesus our Immanuel here—
Mild he lays his glory by,
Born that man no more may die.

Yet the veil was not so dense that the divinity could not send its scintillations through the humanity; the eclipse was not so great but that the divine *corona* was seen shining forth behind the humanity and encircling it with its golden glory!

Surely so close an alliance as this with humanity—humanity

in its deepest abasement and misery—is sufficient for the accomplishment of our redemption, without predicating positive suffering and actual death of him who is over all God blessed forever—the blessed and only Potentate, who only hath immortality, and who is without variableness or shadow of turning.

In his incarnation he assumed the nature of the offending race, and thus the divinity enabled the humanity to make atonement to the Divine Majesty for the great offense. The sacrifice was the Lamb of God—the victim which God demanded, provided, and accepted. When the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world, he prepared for him "a body," that he might be capable of dying, and informed that body with a reasonable soul, so that the divinity did not, as the Apollinarians say, take the place of the soul. The

sacrifice of the body without the soul would have been worthless, hence his "soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death"—"it pleased the Father to bruise him, he hath put him to grief, and made his soul an offering for sin—he poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many."

§ 6. Acts xx. 28.

God is said to purchase the Church with his own blood—for we retain the received text of Acts xx. 282—and we sing:

O Love Divine! what hast thou done!
Th' immortal God hath died for me!
The Father's co-eternal Son
Bore all my sins upon the tree!
Th' immortal God for me hath died!
My Lord, my Love, is crucified!

Neither love nor sorrow was
Like that my Jesus showed;
See him stretched on yonder cross,
And crushed beneath our load!
Now discern the Deity,
Now his heavenly birth declare;
Faith cries out, "'Tis he! 'tis he!"
My God that suffers there!

The day of Christ, the day of God,
We humbly hope with joy to see,
Washed in the sanctifying blood
Of an expiring Deity.

189

Here's love and grief beyond degree,
The Lord of glory dies for man!
But lo! what sadden joys we see!
Jesus, the dead, revives again!
The rising God forsakes the tomb.

When such highly wrought language is used we are to understand it in the sense that one and the same person of whom all

this may be predicated, in one nature, is spoken of by the title of his other nature—that is, he who was God endured all this, because he was also man—as, on the other hand, "the Son of man" is said to perform the acts peculiar to Deity, because he who was man was also God, and in his divine nature performed those acts.

To us this is satisfactory; and it is as credible as the union of the two natures in the one mysterious person, never to be divided, during all of the vicissitudes of his life on earth, his death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, and his everlasting existence in the heaven of heavens.

§ 7. Errors of Orthodox Writers Noticed.

Even in systematic treatises, the great masters of orthodoxy, when reasoning against Socinians and others, who deny the deity of Christ, or Nestorians, who divide his person, sometimes write as if they favored the Theopaschite error, when nothing is farther from their intention.

Thus Hooker says: "No person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of God condemned, the Son of God, and no other person, crucified; which one only point of Christian belief, the infinite worth of the Son of God, is the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or suffered as man in our behalf." The last clause here explains the passage. So Bishop Andrewes: "That which setteth the high price upon this sacrifice is this, that he which offereth it to God *is* God." So Cyril: "Marvel not if the whole world has been redeemed, for he who hath died for us is no mere man, but the only begotten Son of God."

Canon Liddon says: "The divinity of God's own Son, freely given for us sinners to suffer and to die, is the very heart of our Christian faith." "He who is born, who suffers, who dies, who rises and ascends, is known to be personally and literally God." "The Infinite Being, bowing down to self-chosen humiliation

and agony, that, without violating his essential attributes, he might win to himself the hearts of his erring creatures, has provoked an answer of grateful love, first toward himself, and then for his sake toward his creatures." But in other places he guards and qualifies

these statements, as, for example, where, in speaking of Christ's limiting his human knowledge—by the way, improperly referring "that day and that hour," in Mark xiii. 32, to "the day of the last judgment"—he says, in answer to a charge of Nestorianism:

> The question to be considered is, whether such an objection has not a wider scope than you intend. Is it not equally valid against other and undisputed contrasts between the divine and human natures of the Incarnate Son? For example, as God, Christ is omnipresent; as man, he is present at a particular point in space. Do you say that this, however mysterious, is more conceivable than the co-existence of ignorance and knowledge, with respect to a single subject, in a single personality? Let me then ask whether this co-existence of ignorance and knowledge is more mysterious than a co-existence of absolute blessedness and intense suffering? If the scriptural words which describe the sufferings of Jesus are understood literally, without establishing Nestorianism, why are we in danger of Nestorianism if we understand him to be speaking of his manhood when he asserts that the Son is ignorant of the day of judgment? If Jesus, as man, did not enjoy the divine attribute of perfect blessedness, yet without prejudice to his full possession of it as God, why could he not in like manner, as man, be without the divine attribute of perfect knowledge? If, as he knelt in Gethsemane, he was in one sphere of existence, all blessed, and in another "sore amazed, very heavy, sorrowful even unto death," might he not with equal truth be in the one omniscient, and in the other subject to limitations of knowledge? The difficulty is common to all the contrasts of the Divine Incarnation; but these contrasts, while they enhance our sense of our Lord's love and condescension, do not destroy our apprehension of the personal unity of the Incarnate Christ. His single personality has two spheres of existence: in the one it is all-blessed, undying, and omniscient; in the other it meets with pain of mind and body, with actual death, and with a correspondent liability to a limitation of knowledge. No such limitation, we may be sure, can interfere with the completeness of his redemptive office. It cannot be supposed to involve any ignorance of that which the Teacher and Saviour of mankind should know; while yet it suffices to place him as man in a perfect sympathy with the actual conditions of the mental life of his brethren.

There are but few theopaschites, except among the Orientals; those found in Western Europe and America are not generally monophysites—they hold that there are two natures in Christ, and that both suffered. Some of them are patripassians, as the Swedenborgians—of whom, however, there are but few.

The Sabellians are called patripassians; but the leading error of Sabellius—that there is but one person in the Godhead—is

compatible with a denial that the Godhead suffered: if the one person in the Godhead—call him Father or Son—became incarnate, he may have suffered only in the humanity which he assumed. A theopaschite may believe in the atonement by the death of Christ; but his peculiar tenet does not seem to be logically consistent with the scriptural doctrine of our reconciliation to God by the death of his Son.

§ 8. Views of Anglican Broad-churchmen.

The Platonizing divines of the Anglican Broad-church school, such as the late F. W. Robertson and Professor Maurice, inconsistently set forth theopaschite views—we say inconsistently because they hold other, antagonistic, and orthodox principles. They speak of the atonement as being effected through a sacrifice made by God, and by Christ, as the representative man, giving up his will in obedience to the divine will, and the imitation of it, so that God was satisfied with the offering of Christ, because "for the first time he saw human nature a copy of the divine nature: the will of man, the Son, perfectly coincided with the will of God, the Father." Mr. Robertson is perhaps a little more perspicuous in another passage: "All the life of God is a flow of this divine, self-giving charity. Creation itself is sacrifice—the self-impartation of the Divine Being. Redemption, too, is sacrifice, else it could not be love; for which reason we will not surrender one iota of the truth that the death of Christ was the sacrifice of God—the manifestation once in time of that which is the eternal law of his life."

This sets aside the scriptural doctrine of satisfaction and propitiation by the death of Christ, which every Anglican is bound to hold according to the second article: "The Godhead and manhood were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

And so in the Communion Service:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who, by thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our

redemption, who made there (by his oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

Surely this is not a mere sacrifice of either the divine or the

human will in Christ; nor is it a sacrifice which the Father made through the Son; but it is a sacrifice which the Son made to the Father for the world. This agrees with the scriptural representation of this great mystery: “Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor.”

Mr. Robertson himself, when opposing the Apollinarian heresy, says:

> In the life of Christ we find two distinct classes of feeling. When he hungered in the wilderness; when he thirsted on the cross; when he was weary by the well at Sychar—he experienced sensations which belong to the bodily department of human nature. But when out of twelve he selected one to be his bosom friend; when he looked round upon the crowd in anger; when the tears streamed down his cheeks at Bethany; and when he recoiled from the thought of approaching dissolution—these—grief, friendship, fear—were not the sensations of the body, much less were they the attributes of Godhead. They were the affections of an acutely sensitive human soul, alive to all the tenderness, and hopes, and anguish, with which human life is filled, qualifying him to be tempted in all points like as we are.

This, as far as it goes, has the right ring: there is no monophysite or any other kind of theopaschite error about it: the humanity alone suffers.

We are afraid to speculate much upon those great mysteries. We are content to abide by the plain language of Scripture, and the decisions of the first four General Councils, which settled, as was hoped, for all time, the orthodox doctrine concerning the Person of Christ and the Holy Trinity,

All modern orthodox Churches—our own included—abide by their decisions. If any differ from them, while we would not lightly brand them as heretics, we think they should not, by the pulpit or the press, seek to unsettle the minds of others, especially of those who are not capable of arguing on questions so recondite. To say the least, there is no necessity for broaching opinions contrary to the settled faith of the Church.

That the Godhead and manhood were joined together in the Person of Christ, so as never to be divided, may be gathered from such texts as these: John xiv. 1–3; xvii, 5, 24; Rom. vi. 9; Eph. i. 20–23; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. i. 5, 6, 18; iii. 21; v. 13; vii. 17; xiv. 10; xxi. 22, 23; xxii. 1–5. But there seems to be no need of any specific text to prove a point so reasonable. If the humanity

193

were ever to be separated from the divinity of Christ, either by death, annihilation, or separate existence as a personality (which it never had), then, indeed, one would look for some specific revelation—an unambiguous declaration alone would suffice—but there is not the slightest intimation thereof, but, as we have seen, much to the contrary. Every now and then there is a cropping out of the heresy of Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, and his follower Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium. Marcellus taught that the kingdom of Christ will entirely cease at the end of the world; and that the Word (*Logos*) will be resolved again into the Father, and will thus not only cease to reign, but also cease to exist as a distinct personality. His heresy was a sort of Sabellianism, the *Logos* being a kind of emanation from the Father, at the time of the incarnation, to be resolved into the Father at the day of judgment. A mistaken view of 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, has given countenance to this heresy. Bishop Burnet, on the second article, says:

> The doctrine here asserted is plain in the Scriptures, that though the human nature in Christ acted still according to its proper character, and had a peculiar will, yet there was such a constant presence, indwelling, and actuation on it from the eternal *Word*, as did constitute both human and divine nature one *Person*. As these are thus so entirely united, so they are never to be separated. Christ is now exalted to the highest degrees of glory and honor; and the characters of *blessing, honor*, and *glory* are represented, in St. John's visions, as offered "to the Lamb forever and ever." It is true St. Paul speaks as if Christ's mediatory office and kingdom were to cease after the day of judgment, and that then he was to deliver up all to the Father. For though, when the full number of the elect shall be gathered, the full end of his death will be attained; and when these saints shall be glorified with him and by him, his office as Mediator will naturally come to an end; yet his own personal glory shall never cease; and if every saint shall inherit an everlasting kingdom, much more shall he who has merited all that to them, and has conferred it on them, be forever possessed of his glory.

We have said, perhaps, enough on this subject, as we presume few if any are in danger of imbibing the heresy against which this clause of the article is directed. However, as some who have not Bishop Pearson's work on the Creed may like to see what he says on this point, in his exposition of Article VI., we quote as follows, pp. 425, 426:

When all the enemies of *Christ* shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his kingdom, when those which refused him to rule over them shall be slain—that is, when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As, therefore, there shall no longer continue any act of the prophetical part to instruct

nor any act of the priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this regal power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defense and protection. As, therefore, the general notion of a Mediator ceaseth when all are made one, because "a Mediator is not a Mediator of one" (Gal. iii. 20); so every part or branch of that mediatorship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts complete. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For when ail things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.)

Now, though the mediatorship of *Christ* be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed; though the regal office, as part of that mediatorship, be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that *Christ* shall cease to be a King, or lose any of the power and honor which before he had. The dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered; and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us kings and priests, which honor we expect in heaven, believing we shall "reign with him" forever (2 Tim. ii. 12), and therefore forever must believe him King. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever" (Rev. xi. 15); not only to the modificated eternity of his mediatorship, so long as there shall be need of regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect; but also to complete the eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is co-eternal to his divinity.

Lest we should imagine that *Christ* should ever cease to be King, or so interpret this article as if he were after the day of judgment to be removed from the righthand of God, the ancient Fathers added those words to the

Nicene Creed, *whose kingdom shall have no end*, against the heresy which then arose, denying the eternity of the kingdom of *Christ*.

§ 10. Conclusion.

The teaching of the works to which we have referred—and which every theological student should possess—agrees precisely with that of our authorized Catechism, as follows:

Wherein did Christ's humiliation consist? Christ's humiliation consisted in his being born of a woman; in the meanness and poverty of his outward circumstances; in his being forty days tempted of the devil; in his being despised and rejected of men; in his enduring the cursed death of the cross; and in his being buried and continuing under the power of death for a time. Isa. liii. 3: "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." Phil. ii. 7, 8: "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Matt. xii. 40: "So shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Was it necessary that Christ should thus suffer and die for our redemption? It was; for by that means he offered a full satisfaction and atonement to Divine justice

for the sins of the whole world. 1 John ii. 2: "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

How did the death of Christ satisfy Divine justice? Our sins deserved death; but Christ being both God and man, and perfectly righteous, there was an infinite value and merit in his death, which being undergone for our sakes and in our stead, Almighty God exercises his mercy in the forgiveness of sins, consistently with his justice and holiness. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19: "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. iii. 18: "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." Rom. iii. 26: "That he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

From the foregoing it appears that the doctrine of the incarnation is to be viewed in connection with that of the atonement—the one has no significance apart from the other. The Eternal Word was "made man, for man to die."

[This view of the scriptural and ecclesiastical doctrine of one Person and two natures in Christ may well conclude with the

formula adopted at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), which gave final form to the orthodox doctrine:

Following the holy fathers, we unanimously teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect as to his Godhead and perfect as to his manhood, truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting: consubstantial with his Father as to his Godhead, and consubstantial with us as to his manhood; like unto us in all things, yet without sin; as to his Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds; but, as to his manhood, in these last days born, for us men and our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God;[3] one and the same Christ; Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known and acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without severance, and without division; the distinction of the natures being in nowise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and the two concurring in one Person and Hypostasis. We confess not a Son divided and sundered into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, and God-Logos, our Lord Jesus Christ, even as the prophets had before proclaimed concerning him, and he himself hath taught us, and the symbol of the fathers hath handed down to us.]

---

1. There is a remarkable various reading in Heb. ii. 9. The true reading and rendering is this: "Jesus, however, who was made lower—somewhat less—than angels for the suffering of death, in order that by God's favor he might taste death for every one, we see crowned with glory and honor." But instead of Χάριτι Θεοῦ, by God's favor, Origen followed some MSS. which read χωρὶς Θεοῦ, "without God." So some Syriac copies. So also says Whitby, "Ambrose, *De Fide ad Gratianum*, c. 4, *et Virgilius Tapsensis*, 1. 2, pp. 17 and 20. And this reading either confutes the Patripassians, or confirms the doctrine of Irenaeus, that Christ suffered ἠσυχάζοντος τοῦ λόγου, the divine nature being quiescent, and not exerting its energy to strengthen him against, or deliver him from, these sufferings—it making its impressions upon the human nature, saith Grotius, not always, but *pro temporum ratione.*" The reading of the received Syriac version, however, is to this effect: *Ipse enim Deus per gratiam suam pro omnibus.* ↩
2. See note on p. 164.—T. ↩
3. For the significance of this title as against the Nestorians, see pp. 197, 198, 200, 201. ↩

Chapter III. Restatement of the Incarnation.

§ 1. The Position Defined.

196

It is not without good reason that the article so explicitly states that Christ "truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men:" this, in fact, was the great end of his incarnation. Let us present a concise *résumé* of this point, noting certain plausible theories which diverge from the teaching of our Confession. First, let us note distinctly what we mean by the incarnation.

By the incarnation we mean the assumption of human nature by the divine. The term, indeed, is a *synecdoche*—a part being put for the whole; and in this case, the lesser part, namely, the flesh—that is, the body. It was suggested by John i. 14, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;" 1 Tim. iii. 16, "God was manifest in the flesh;" and 1 John iv. 3, "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." If it can be believed that the Eternal Word (*Logos*) assumed real flesh—that is, a body like our own—it can readily be credited that he took our spiritual nature as well. Few have been inclined to the Apollinarian heresy, that the *Logos* supplied the place of a spiritual nature in the Incarnate Son. No, he had a soul as well as a body—"perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." There was no change in the divinity—no change in the humanity: the *Logos* was not properly "made flesh," but assumed it; the humanity did not absorb the divinity, though it enshrined it—that is to say, was personally united to it; so that the divinity was in the man Jesus as it never was in any other being, and was present where he was as it was present nowhere else. The union was so intimate that, though there was no confusion of the two natures—so that the human intellect, sensibilities, and will remained intact, and corresponding attributes, or powers, remained intact in the divinity—yet there was but one Person. Thus, without any difficulty, we can see

197

how predicates peculiar to the divine nature may be spoken of as belonging to the human, and predicates peculiar to the human nature may be predicated of the divine. Thus the Son of man raises the dead and judges the world, because he who is man is also God—he does it in his divine nature; and the eternal *Logos* grows in wisdom and stature, endures the infirmities and afflictions of life, and suffers the agonies of death, because he who is God is also man—he experiences all this in his human nature. Thus he is at once finite and infinite, passible and impassible, mortal and immortal—which explains the paradox of the poet:

Let earth and heaven combine,
Angels and men agree,
To praise in songs divine
Th' incarnate Deity;
Our God contracted to a span,
Incomprehensibly made man.

He laid his glory by,
He wrapped him in our clay;
Unmarked by human eye,
The latent Godhead lay;
Infant of days he here became,
And bore the mild Immanuel's name.

In a popular way, we speak of the Incarnation and Nativity of Christ as identical. This is natural, as we take no cognizance of him till his birth. But, as is confessed in the Nicene Creed—"who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary"—he really became incarnate in the womb of the Virgin. The divine *Logos* was mysteriously united to the humanity, when that was originated by the power of the Holy Ghost. (Luke i. 35.) It is only a deeper mystery, though of the same kind, with that which we encounter in the union of the divinity with the humanity during the infancy of the Son of God.

The controversy, therefore, between the Nestorians and the Catholics, or orthodox, in regard to the application of the terms *Theotokos, Deipara, Mater Dei*—Mother of God—is a war of words, as neither party held on the one hand that Jesus was a mere man at his birth (as some of the Gnostics taught), nor on the other, that his divine nature was begotten of the substance of the Virgin—it was

hypostatically, or personally, united with it—that is all: “God of the substance of the Father, begotten before all

worlds, and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world.” As, in order to purge ourselves of heresy, and declare our orthodoxy, it is not necessary for us to speak of the Virgin as the “mother of God,” especially as the title has been so misunderstood and abused to superstitious and idolatrous purposes, it may as well be ignored. So it is a vain and curious thing to inquire how the soul of Christ originated, whether by creation or traduction. All that is necessary is to confess that he was so conceived in the womb, and born of the Virgin, as to be her true, human son—she being in the proper sense his real mother, producing him as other mothers produce their children, except the miraculous conception; while, by virtue of that miraculous conception through the power of the Holy Ghost, he was perfectly immaculate—being, in the womb, at his birth, and ever after, free from all taint of inherent and inherited depravity, and also of all actual sin. Our Confession well defines it: “Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man.” From the moment when his divinity was hypostatically united with his humanity in the womb of the Virgin, to all eternity that union remains. The divinity was never separated from the humanity—not on the cross; not when his spirit was in paradise, and his body in the tomb; not when his humanity was glorified in the ascension; not now while he is on the mediatorial throne; not, as some vainly dream, when he shall deliver up the mediatorial kingdom to the Father: “the God” will forever “shine gracious through the man.”

And thus “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” This is the great miracle of the ages. What event can compare with this in grandeur and mystery? A God, a God appears! clothed in a real body like our own!

§ 2. Errors Opposed.

1. Who is he that thus became incarnate? Was he an angel? No. Of what avail would have been the incarnation of an angel, or of

any other created intelligence, to propitiate the offended Majesty of the universe, and "to save a world of sinners lost?"

199

2. Was he an inferior god, begotten by the Father in the remote ages of eternity, but still not eternal—of a similar, but not an identical, nature?[1] This is an Arian figment—a preposterous impossibility. Such a being would be neither divine, human, nor angelic. Neither Scripture nor reason knows any thing of such a monstrosity as that!

3. Was the Word the Father himself? So say the Sabellians and Patripassians, indorsed by the Swedenborgians. But he could not be the Father, simply because he was the Son of the Father. He possessed the same nature because he was, in the proper sense, his Son; but as he was his Son, he could not be the Father himself. Hence the Word was "with God"—that is, with the Father—while he "was God"—that is, essentially divine. John says: "We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."

4. Was he a pre-existent man—a human soul created before the foundation of the world, and in the fullness of time united with the *Logos*, to a body in the womb of the Virgin? We should hardly have thought it necessary to allude to this vagary, which was held by some divines of the last century, and even at one time favored by Dr. Watts—in connection with what was called the "Indwelling Scheme"—if it had not been revived in our own day.[2] There is not a single passage of Scripture which, properly interpreted, gives the slightest sanction to so wild a conceit, which is as repulsive to reason as it is to Revelation. The preadvent appearances of Christ—if he did appear to men before he was born of the Virgin—were not those of an apparition, an unembodied spirit. If the *Logos*, or a created angel, appeared to men, it was by assuming a bodily vehicle, or what seemed to be such—so that those phenomena give no support to this extravagant notion, which is too near akin to Arianism to be tolerated for a moment. His humiliation was not that of a human soul, consenting to be born, but of the divine *Logos*, who "did not abhor the Virgin's womb." That which was born of her was the Son of God and the Son of man; and, being the latter as well as the former, the Babe of Bethlehem possessed the soul of

200

an infant, just like any other child; and he increased in wisdom as

he grew in stature.[3]

5. When it is said "the Word was made flesh," it does not mean that there was any change of the divine into the human nature of Christ. Divinity is impassible, immutable, cannot be converted into any other nature. Hence the absurdity of certain Anabaptists who affirm that the divine nature of Christ was transubstantiated into the human. How can the infinite, indivisible, immaterial, immortal divinity be changed into such a being as man, whose spirit has limited faculties, and whose body is mere matter, subject to all the conditions of a material substance? This is a palpable contradiction: spirit is not matter, nor a property of matter, as some modern materialists say; Divinity is not humanity, nor could the Word cease to be divine when he assumed humanity—which is the meaning of the language, "the Word was made flesh."[4]

6. Neither was there a change of the humanity into divinity—the dream of the Monophysites, the followers of Eutyches, in the fifth century. As the infinite cannot become finite, so the finite cannot become infinite. Was not that which was begotten of the substance of the Virgin like the Virgin of whom it was born? Was it not a man—"of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting?" So was it at the conception, so was it at the birth. And did not Jesus exhibit all the proofs of manhood, as well as all the tokens of Godhead, while he remained upon the earth? Does he not now, and will he not forever, display both these natures in his one mysterious Person, as he is seated "on the right hand of the Majesty on high?"

7. We say, "one mysterious Person." For while we must not convert one nature into another—the divine into the human, nor the human into the divine—we must not divide the Person of our Lord, "who, although he be God and man, yet is he but one Christ"—contrary to the vague error imputed to the Nestorians. No, there is a duality of nature, but a unity of person. The Greek and Latin fathers did not scruple to call Mary "the mother of God,"[5] as well as the mother of the Son of God, or

the Son of man, because the hypostatic union took place before the birth of Christ. The divine nature was not superinduced upon him after his birth, at his baptism, or at any other time, but at his conception. If the Nestorians had simply scrupled to call Mary "the mother of God," on the ground that divinity cannot be properly the subject of maternity, as God cannot be born of the substance of a

woman, their scruples might have been allowed; but their scruples are said to have gone further than that: they absurdly maintained (as reported of them) that there are two persons as well as two natures in Christ. But that is not so. He who was born of the Virgin was God as well as man at the time of his birth; and as we say that God suffered and died, meaning that a person who was God as well as man suffered and died, though the divine nature did not suffer and die, because it is impassible and immortal, so it is said that God was born of the Virgin, because he who was God as well as man was so born—though the divine nature was united to the humanity by incarnation, and not by the natural process of maternity. As the two natures were then united, so they are "never to be divided." Yet some say they are to be divided. By a misunderstanding of 1 Cor. xv. 24–28 they infer that when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, the *Logos* will be separated from the humanity of Christ, leaving the latter "to remain forever the most highly honored created or begotten existence in the universe."[6] This Neo-Nestorianism is as absurd as it is unscriptural. It is a modification of the heresy of Marcellus and Photinus, who taught that the *Logos* will be resolved into the Father, and the humanity will cease to exist. They did not know what to do with it when separated from the divinity. But the Nicene Fathers properly maintained that the union begun in the incarnation will never be dissolved; that Christ in his glorified humanity will be seated forever at the right hand of the Father; and that his "kingdom shall have no end"—a clause inserted in the Nicene Creed against the heresy which denies the eternity of the kingdom of Christ.

8. We must not confound the two natures in Christ, as if in the union there was some compromise, the divinity surrendering some of its properties, and the humanity surrendering some—a

third essence, a *tertium quid*, being the result. This ancient heresy, which has been revived in our day, was opposed by the Fathers; the so-called Athanasian Creed proscribes it in these words: "One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." The material nature of man is not confounded with his immaterial in order to constitute him one person; so the human is not confounded with the divine in Christ to constitute him one person. When it is said the Word was made flesh it must not be

supposed it means that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, the material nature, to which the Word was joined. This was a vagary of Arius.

9. As little must it be imagined that, while he possessed a human soul,[7] he did not possess a human mind[8] or spirit—the Word supplying the place of that! To say nothing of the baseless theory of trichotomy—that is, that man possesses three distinct natures—it is very clear that Jesus did have a "reasonable soul"—not a mere animal or vegetal soul, or whatever else the nondescript of Apollinaris may be called. He had a human mind, spirit, soul[9]—that is, an immaterial nature identical with ours, susceptible of growth and development, of hope and fear, anger and love, grief and joy.[10] In a word, his immaterial nature, as a man, was like ours, possessed of intellect, will, and sensibility; and not one of these properties was absorbed, transubstantiated, or annihilated, by the divine nature, to which the human was allied. As to his corporeal nature, that was formed out of the substance of the Virgin—not by creation, but by generation. Hence, being "born of a woman," who "was of the house and lineage of David," he was properly a man—a son of man, as he styles himself—a descendant of David and of Abraham—the predicted "seed of the woman."[11] His body was therefore formed in the womb of the Virgin, and brought forth by her, just as our bodies were formed and brought forth: the process of maternity being the same in both cases.

10. It is absurd to affirm, as some Socinians do, that the Virgin

furnished some elements of his body—hence he is called the "Son of man"—and the Holy Ghost furnished some—hence he is called "the Son of God." What a monstrous hybrid would that be! It would be neither human nor divine! "But," as Bishop Pearson says, "as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he is not the father of him, though he were conceived by him." There were no material elements in the person of Christ, as he was born of the Virgin, but those that he received from her.

11. As to his soul, when our philosophers can settle the controversy between the creationists and the traducianists, it will be time enough to inquire how the spiritual nature of Christ was

united with his corporeal nature. It is enough for us to know that as "the Son of man," with a body and a soul, he was born of a woman; that, as we have seen, he manifested all the qualities and attributes of humanity; and was therefore very man as well as very God. But then it is not true to affirm, with the rationalists of our day, that because he was very man—"of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting"—having a woman for his mother, in the proper sense of the expression, that therefore his conception was not supernatural—that Joseph or some other man was his father as Mary was his mother. There is nothing on which the Scripture is more explicit than this, that as his divinity was begotten without a mother, from eternity, so his humanity was begotten in time without a father. He "was conceived by the Holy Ghost:" not by any communication of his essence, as in human paternity, but by a miraculous operation which enabled the Virgin to perform the functions of maternity, and be a Virgin still!

12. It is a great heresy to say, with Edward Irving, that Christ partook of our sinful nature. By virtue of his "immaculate conception," Christ was "made in the likeness of sinful flesh," and yet he "knew no sin," he "did no sin," "in him is no sin." He is the only one of our race who was not born in sin, who had no inherent, inherited depravity. The fifteenth article of the Anglican Confession, entitled, "Christ alone without sin," says: "Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all

things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him." This was his exclusive prerogative.

For he who can for sin atone
Must have no failings of his own.

It was not until the late Pope, Pius IX., ascended the papal throne that the heresy which had been long developing in the Romish Church—that the Virgin herself was conceived and born without sin—was made a dogma necessary to be believed. The indorsement of such a heresy was a fit prelude to the Vatican Council's decree which makes the Pope infallible!

13. "That holy thing" which was born of the Virgin was real

humanity. Christ was “very man”—that is, a true, real man, just as any of us, with the exception of sin, which is adventitious to our nature. This is a point of fundamental importance. Hence John says: “Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.”[12] It is generally thought that John here alludes to the Docetists, or Phantastists, a sect of Gnostics that denied the proper humanity of Christ. They absurdly held that Jesus was not what he seemed to be; that he was only a man in *appearance*—hence the name given to this sect;[13] that he merely *seemed* to be a human infant, boy, man; that he did not *really* suffer what he *seemed* to endure—that is, it was all a sham! It is said that Simon Magus was the father of this preposterous heresy—a fit paternity! These Gnostics, of course, denied the resurrection of Christ, for if he had no real body to suffer and die, he had none to rise from the dead. Thus the denial of the proper incarnation of Christ caused a denial of his resurrection; and it may be well for those who are now denying his real resurrection to see if this will not, by a reverse process, cause a denial of his incarnation. What impudence is it in those who hold such views to profess and call themselves Christians! They had better, like Renan and Strauss, renounce

the Christian name. Was not Jesus a real infant when Mary bore him, and Herod sought to kill him? Was he not a real boy when he went up with his friends to Jerusalem, tarried in the temple conversing with the doctors, and, returning to Nazareth, was subject to his mother and reputed father, and grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man? Was he not a real man when he was baptized by John, when he fasted in the wilderness, when he hungered and thirsted, when he “came eating and drinking” like other men, waking and sleeping, experiencing fatigue and repose, sweating and bleeding, bowing his head and giving up the ghost? Was not this body like any other corpse when it was laid in Joseph’s tomb? And after his resurrection did he not say to his disciples, who “were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit,” “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as

ye see me have?" Did he not eat with them, as he had been accustomed to eat with them before his passion? (Luke xxiv. 36–43.) And was this a mere make-believe eating, such as might be imagined of a phantom? He who can believe all this has unlimited credulity and can accept all the tales of the Talmud and the fables of the Koran! Heresies are like fashions in dress—they come and go and come again. Sometimes it is *fashionable* to deny the essential divinity of our Lord; at other times it is the fashion to deny his proper humanity; and we should not be at all surprised if those who are not satisfied with "the common salvation," as a thing too vulgar for them, should revive from its state of suspended animation the groundless heresy of the docetists, who denied that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh. They might just as well deny his proper incarnation as deny his real resurrection: they cannot consistently deny the latter and affirm the former. Meanwhile we shall still profess "the faith once delivered to the saints:" "God was manifested in the flesh;" "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

14. We cannot countenance the *quasi* Platonian notion that the Eternal *Logos* would have been incarnated if man had never sinned and stood in need of reconciliation to God—that man was originally created in the image of God, with proleptic reference

to the incarnate *Logos*, and thus he is styled the Son of man, as the archetype of humanity. There is not a *scintilla* of evidence of this in revelation, and we see no reason for it whatever.

15. Near akin to this fancy is the notion of some of the mediaeval mystics. Ruusbroec, for example, held that man, in body and soul, is like God, and the design of the incarnation is to teach this similarity of nature, and so the ethical inference that man has the power to imitate God. There is no need of expiation on this scheme; no need, in fact, to subject the body to any mortifications in order to lead a spiritual life, as Christ sanctified the flesh when he became incarnate. The incarnation, thus distorted, became the absorbing element in his system, to the exclusion of the doctrine of propitiation by the death of Christ. He taught that man could become a partaker of the divine nature, as God became a partaker of human nature—the incarnation makes it possible for man, in body and soul, to be like God. Some of the mystics improved upon

this theory—Seuss, for example, who taught that as in the incarnation Christ took man's nature, to live man's life, and by the royal way of suffering to return to the Father, so we are to imitate him—live his life as he lived ours. But this, like the other, dispenses with atonement—the one is rationalistic, and is reproduced, in substance, by many Unitarians and Broad-churchmen of the English Establishment; while the other still finds indorsement among ascetics in and out of the Romish communion. There is much truth in the views adopted by the mystics, but as held by them it is one-sided and distorted.

§ 3. Design of the Incarnation.

As God is chary in his miraculous operations, never deviating from the natural laws which he has established for the government of the world, except on extraordinary occasions, and for specially important ends, we may be sure that interests of a transcendentally important character are to be subserved by this astounding miracle of the incarnation.

Many of our modern scientists ignore teleology—final causes, design, intention, in nature. But we are not arguing with them now. They deny the fact of the incarnation altogether, and thus the design of it is to them a grand impertinence. But our *Anno Domini* is a perpetual memorial of the fact; than which, indeed, nothing in history is better established.

207

Unquestionably the grand end of the incarnation is the sacrificial death by which a world of sinners lost was to be redeemed. God was "made man for man to die." Other ends are important as subsidiary or ancillary to this; but this is the great necessitating cause of the incarnation.

The rebels of this revolted province cannot be reconciled to their offended Sovereign and restored to their place among the loyal subjects of his empire, except through some expedient by which the majesty of the Sovereign, the interests of his subjects, and the fealty of the rebels themselves, may be secured. All these three ends are realized by this wonderful arrangement. The mere incarnation of Deity could not accomplish it, as that of itself has nothing to do with the sin of the world. But when a body is

prepared for the Son of God, informed by a rational, human soul, hypostatically united with his personal Divinity; when it pleased Jehovah to bruise him, to put him to grief, to make him an offering for sin, so that he was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, set forth a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, to declare his righteousness that God might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus—the sufferings and death being real, because he was man, and infinitely meritorious, because he was God, thus capable of realizing the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and a sense of the wrath of the offended Deity, filling his soul with an agony which would crush the world—then we can have some conception of the *rationale* of this wonderful expedient. We see how there is satisfaction made to all the perfections of the Godhead, so that they harmonize in the pardon of sinners thus redeemed, they being penitent, believing, and obedient. God shines forth in this transaction "full-orbed, in his whole round of rays complete." But this will be discussed under the head of "Atonement."

§ 4. Importance of the Incarnation.

We have called the incarnation the most stupendous *fact* known to men—perhaps to angels; and we have made a restatement of the *doctrine* of the incarnation.

On *a priori* grounds one would consider that this is a doctrine of transcendent importance. A God would not be thus brought on the scene of human affairs, if the occasion were not worthy of the divine *avatar*. The occasion, indeed, warrants this manifestation

of Godhead. Here, truly, the end justifies the means: both means and end are worthy of a God.

1. The Eternal *Logos*, the Divine Word, became incarnate to make known, in the clearest, fullest, and most authoritative manner, the mind and will of God to the world.

The peculiar name of the Second Person of the Trinity is highly suggestive—the *Logos*—the Word. The Latins render it both *ratio* and *oratio*—reason and speech, thought and utterance, mind and expression. What is thought, but unuttered language? What is language, but uttered thought? Thus, as toward the other Divine

Persons of the Trinity, the *Logos* is *Ratio*—the immanent *Idea* of Godhead—as toward men, the *Logos* is *Oratio*—the *Idea* of Godhead expressed—"the Brightness of the Father's glory, and the Express Image of his Person." He is the Great Revealer. He is the Light of the world.

The knowledge of God was lost by the fall of man; it is recovered by the Divine Word: not by his teaching merely, nor principally, but by his personal manifestation. Thus he says, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." He who has seen the wisdom, power, and love which beam through the humanity of Christ, as the soul manifests itself through the body—which is what is meant by seeing Christ—has in effect seen the Father, for the attributes of the one are those of the other. Abstract statements concerning God—his attributes, his will, his designs—cannot affect us so powerfully as the concrete revelation of him in the Person of his Son.

The coming event, as it cast its shadow before, in ancient prophecy and type, powerfully stimulated the faith and hope of those who lived under the old dispensations. The accomplished fact, viewed by us, as the great cardinal point of all history, transcends every thing else in its influence on the mind and heart and life. God incarnate comes very near to us, answering with the most emphatic affirmative the question, "Will God, in very deed, dwell with man upon the earth?" He will; he has done so in the Person of Immanuel —"God with us!" He has softened the blazing beams of Godhead, by passing them through the attempering medium of his spotless humanity. We can now "behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord;" or, as elsewhere expressed, "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

209

In the most affecting, because the most familiar, manner, the Incarnate Word has made known the will of God to the world. Not in the thunder and lightning of Sinai, but in the forms of human speech; in sermon, dialogue, parable, allegory; simple, yet sublime; condescending, for it is a man conversing with men, yet authoritative, for "never man spake like this man"—"God hath spoken unto us by his Son." There can be no clearer, no fuller, no more authoritative utterances than these. This was one great object of his incarnation: to tell us all that is necessary to be known of God in the present state of existence, all that is required of us as duty

toward God and one another, all that is proper to be revealed of the retributions of another state of existence to move us to its performance. All the light and influence of the Holy Spirit comes through his incarnation. Thus the ancient predictions concerning him have been fulfilled:

> The Saviour comes, by ancient bards foretold:
> Hear him, ye deaf! and all ye blind, behold!
> He from thick films shall purge the visual ray,
> And on the sightless eyeball pour the day.

2. The Word assumed humanity and dwelt among us to illustrate the transcendent excellence and the practicability of virtue.

He was "full of grace and truth." He was "holy, harmless, undefiled." He was "separate from sinners" in his character, yet familiar with them in his life.

It was foreseen that he would resist temptation, and be absolutely free from moral taint to the end of his life; though, as a man, he had the power of alternate choice, and might have yielded, like the first Adam, to the temptation of Satan. The union of the divinity with the humanity did not necessitate the indefectibility of the latter, as the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in Adam did not guarantee his continuance in well-doing. It made it possible for him not to sin, but it did not make it impossible for him to sin.

Being perfectly holy, Jesus could and did exemplify the beauty of holiness, so that we can see in him its divine attractiveness. Virtue was incarnate in Christ. It is impossible not to be fascinated with such moral excellence. We can behold the properties of the law of God, as holy, just, and good, in its abstract character, in the statute-book of Heaven; but how much more

glorious do they appear by concrete revelation in the Person and life of the Son of God!

> My dear Redeemer, and my Lord,
> I read my duty in thy word;
> But in thy life the law appears
> Drawn out in living characters.
> Such was thy truth, and such thy zeal,
> Such deference to thy Father's will,
> Such love, and meekness, so divine,

I would transcribe, and make them mine.

And it was for this purpose that virtue was thus displayed to the world, that we might imitate it. “We ought also so to walk, even as he also walked.” As he lived and loved and labored and suffered, so may we live and love and labor and suffer, with the same sanctity and ardor and energy and patience—the same at least, in kind, if not in degree, for he was a man like one of us. We may, and should, purify ourselves, even as he is pure. He, indeed, needed no purification; but though we, polluted sinners, do need it, and cannot “bring a clean thing out of an unclean”—yet he has procured for us the gracious power that can; and being “made free from sin, and become servants to God, we have our fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.” He can cleanse us by his Spirit, and by the same Divine Agent he can keep us clean. He “is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy.”

What human virtue did he possess, to which we may not attain? What duty did he discharge, which we may not perform? “But we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.” “Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, for as he is, so are we in this present world.” His example, like a splendid portrait, is held up to our view in the inspired records, and we are called upon to

Behold the awful portrait, and admire,
Nor stop t’ admire, but imitate and live!

3. He was made man to die for men. This was the great design of his incarnation. He would not have become flesh, if his death had not been necessary for the redemption of the world. The mere fact of incarnation could not accomplish this.

Whether, without his intervention, our guilty race might have been restored to the favor and image of God, it would be temerity in us to say. This much we must say, we can imagine no other method. And for the matter of fact, we know that “there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.” And just as certain is it that, while he could not die if he had not become incarnate, his incarnation would not have saved us if it had not terminated in his death and resurrection. “We are reconciled unto

God by the death of his Son." He "was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification." "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."

It must be borne in mind that, though Divinity could not suffer and die, a Divine Person could and did suffer and die. It was a perfect man—"a lamb without blemish and without spot"—whose "precious blood" was poured out in sacrifice for a world of sinners lost. But he could have had no blood to shed if he had not been made flesh, and his blood would have had no vicarious value if he had not been perfect as a man, and no expiatory virtue if he had not been God as well as man, to give an infinite dignity to the Sufferer, and an infinite value to the sufferings which he endured for our fallen race. This will fully appear when we discuss the atoning character of the death of Christ.

But it must be borne in mind that while without the shedding of blood there can be no remission, no reconciliation, without the incarnation there could have been no blood to shed—no sacrificial death—for the Eternal Word could not die till he "was made flesh." The atoning sacrifice does not consist in the love of the Father, who gave his only begotten Son for our salvation. That, indeed, was great love wherewith he loved us; but the Scriptures nowhere call that a sacrifice, as some *quasi* Patripassians speak. The Father did not suffer for our sins. Nor does

it consist in the act of the Son assuming our nature—that was great condescension, indeed—but that is not called his sacrifice. This Theopaschite vagary has no countenance in Scripture. But it was necessary that the Father should give the Son, and that the Son should become incarnate, in order that the sacrifice might be made. Hence "he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." On the cross, as on an altar, "he offered himself up without spot to God." "Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-

smelling savor." "He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"—"was once offered to bear the sins of many." "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all." "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

It was thus the spotless humanity, body and soul, which he assumed in the womb of the Virgin, that was offered for the sins of men. "His back was given to the smiters;" "his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;" "he hath poured out his soul unto death;" "and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

There could have been no sacrifice without his humanity; and he could have had no humanity without incarnation—none that could merit the redemption of man. Thus we see the transcendent importance of this doctrine.

4. He became man, and perpetuates his humanity, in order to perform all other mediatorial services required by our fallen and ransomed race.

He was subject to all the conditions of humanity (sin only excepted) that he might sympathize with his afflicted members.

There is a difference between the compassion of God and the sympathy of the God-man. Having passed through all our state of suffering and sorrow, temptation and trial, pain and death, he can enter into our feelings, he can bear with our infirmities, he can minister to our wants in a manner so human as to elicit our confidence, animate our hope, and endue us with the patience and fortitude and courage which we need for the battle of life. "For we have not a high-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." We are greatly affected by knowing that

he is the Head of that body of which we are the members—consequently if we suffer, he feels the pang; if we are persecuted, he is persecuted in us; if we are relieved by the hand of charity, he recognizes the kindness as done to himself; and when we die it is almost as if he died again, he is so nearly identified with us.

The sublime sentiment of the old Roman, "I am a man, and consider nothing that is human alien from me" (*Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto*), may be said by him with infinitely greater propriety, as he is not only a man but "the Son of man"—the representative of our race, and by virtue of his hypostatic union

with divinity, comprehends the precise condition and wants of every child of man. He has passed through the vale of tears, and the valley of the shadow of death, and knows what living and dying mean. Thus we have the strongest assurance that he can sympathize with us and succor us, "in all time of our tribulation; in all time of our wealth; in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment."

And sinners may die, for the Sinless hath died.

Then the meritorious services which he has performed for our race and the perfect obedience which he rendered to his Heavenly Father qualify him for the work of our Advocate—our *Paraclete*—in heaven, the Patron of those he became incarnate to save. "Five bleeding wounds he bears," which plead powerfully and successfully on our behalf. "The Father cannot turn away the presence of his Son," who, as our Elder Brother, pleads for us, and urges in our behalf his meritorious life and death—all that he has done and suffered in our stead and for our salvation. Having lived and died for us, and risen again, he ever liveth to make intercession for us. Our names are on his breastplate, and he bears them before the mercy-seat, in the Most Holy Place. It is well to have such a Friend at court.

He took our mortal flesh, to show
The wonders of his love;
For us he paid his life below,
And prays for us above.
He ever lives to intercede
Before his Father's face:
Give him, my soul, thy cause to plead,
Nor doubt the Father's grace.

As the result of his intercession that "other *Paraclete*" is sent

to us, to abide with us forever. It was expedient that the bodily presence of Jesus should be removed from us, to be substituted by the Holy Spirit. By his efficacious operations Christ is, as it were, incarnated in every believer: "formed in you," says the apostle. By regeneration we are made partakers of a divine nature as by incarnation he assumed our nature. There could have been no regeneration of man, so far as we know, without the incarnation of God.

He deigns in flesh t' appear,
Widest extremes to join.
To bring our vileness near.
And make us all divine;
And we the life of God shall know.
For God is manifest below.

We believe that he will come to be our Judge.

It affords us great satisfaction to know that the Judge is our Mediator—God, yet man—for God the Father "hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that *man* whom he hath ordained." The Father and the Son, indeed, are agreed in their judgment—the awards of the one are approved by the other; but it is encouraging to know that he by whom we are judged is man as well as God—our Friend, our Brother, who cannot be harsh in his judgment, because "he knoweth our frame" by his own experience, and will graduate his awards according to the requirements of mercy as well as justice. He will judge righteous judgment; but this requires a due regard to all the conditions of our mortal life; and as Jesus passed through, them when on the earth, in the body, which he still has in heaven, we can look forward to the time "when he shall appear," and have the comfortable hope, through grace, that we shall "have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming."

In his first advent he came as a man: in his second advent he shall also come as a man—in the same body which was born of the Virgin, only glorified.

Let us, then, with joy and gratitude, celebrate his first coming as "the Babe of Bethlehem"—avail ourselves of all the blessings which result from his wonderful incarnation, that we may be prepared to hail with rapture his second coming "without sin unto salvation."

---

1. ὁμοούσιος but not ὁμοιούσιος.↩
2. *Vide* "Outlines of Theology," by L. T. Townsend, D.D. New York: Nelson & Phillips.↩
3. See a complete refutation of this heresy in Watson's Theological Dictionary, under "Pre-existence of Christ."↩
4. Καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. (John i. 14.)↩

5. Θεοτόκος, *Deipara*.↩
6. “Outlines of Theology,” by L. T. Townsend. D.D.↩
7. The word is ψυχή.↩
8. Νοῦς.↩
9. Νοῦς, πνεῦμα, ψυχή.↩
10. Luke ii. 52; x. 21; xxii. 41–44; Matt. xxvi. 38–44; John xi. 33–38; Mark iii. 5; Heb. v. 7, xii. 2.↩
11. Gen. iii. 15; Luke ii.; Matt. ii.; John vii. 42; Rom. i. 4; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. ii. 14–18; Rev. xxii. 16.↩
12. 1 John iv. 2, 3.↩
13. Δοκηταί, (Lat. *Docetae*), from δοκέω, to seem.↩

Part III. The Atonement.

Chapter I. The Sufferings, Crucifixion, Death, and Burial of Christ

§ 1. Introductory

215
The pleonastic style of the clause, “who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried,” is by no means tautological. It is taken from the Apostles’ Creed—“suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.” In the most ancient Creeds, indeed, it reads simply, “Was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried;” or merely, “was crucified and buried.” “Under Pontius Pilate” was properly added to fix the time, as gainsaying Jews falsified the chronology to discredit the fact. But other Jewish testimonials, as well as heathen, so perfectly agree with the evangelists and apostles and fathers of the Church in regard to the time—viz., in the reign of Tiberius, when Pilate was Procurator[1] of Judea—that it was not thought necessary to state it in the Confession.

It was proper to use all the four terms, “suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried,” because he might have suffered without being crucified; he might have been crucified, not indeed without suffering, but without suffering apart from the crucifixion, which is here implied; he might have suffered and been crucified without dying; and he might have died without previous suffering, and without subsequent burial, as it was not uncommon for those who were crucified to be denied burial; and he might have been buried without previously dying: in that case his resuscitation from a swoon or asphyxia would have been no resurrection. But the pleonasm employed settles all these questions, and precludes all these scruples.

This passage—indeed the whole second article—is copied nearly *verbatim* from the Augsburg Confession, which reads

216
(Art. III. “Of the Son of God and His Mediatorial Work”): “The Word, that is the Son of God, assumed human nature, in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that the two natures, human and divine, inseparably united in one person, constitute one Christ, who

is true God and man, born of the Virgin Mary; who truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a sacrifice not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of men." The word "atonement" is not used in the article, nor indeed anywhere in the Confession or in the English Liturgy, which abounds with terms expressive of the doctrine—*e. g.*, in the Communion Service: "Who made thus by his oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." "Atonement," so frequently used in the Old Testament, is used but once in the Authorized Version of the New Testament (Rom. v. 11), where καταλλαγή should be rendered reconciliation, as in Wycliffe and Rheims. Our translation followed Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva in this place. Shakespeare and other old writers use it in the sense of *making at one*, or "reconciliation;" not "expiation," the present theological sense of the word *atonement*. Its ambiguity may account for its omission in these formularies.

§ 2. Christ Truly Suffered.

The "one Christ, very God and very man," truly suffered—not the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but the Son, as he is Christ, possessing a human nature in which he could suffer. This is opposed to the patripassians and the theopaschites, as it restricts the sufferings to the Son and to the human nature which he assumed. It is also opposed to the *Docetae*, who held that he suffered only in appearance—that his humanity was a mere phantasm. This heresy arose in the first century, and was opposed by John in his Epistles, and by the Fathers.

Christ was very God and also very man, and so he *truly* suffered. The Latin reads: *Verus Deus, et verus homo, qui vere passus est.* There was *real* divinity, *real* humanity, and *real* suffering.

Christ was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief through the whole course of his ministry; but the suffering here meant is that called by eminence "his passion" (Acts i. 3), beginning

on the night in which he was betrayed, and ending when "he bowed his head and gave up the ghost:" all being crowded into the short space of about eighteen hours!

His suffering was both physical and mental.

The physical suffering consisted, in the bloody sweat in the garden, the buffeting, scourging, coronary thorns, bearing the cross, and being nailed to it—a death most excruciating—hence that word: from *ex-*, out of, and *cruciare*, to slay on the cross.

The mental suffering consisted in fearful apprehensions, unknown sorrows, and anguish inexpressible. In his agony in the garden, when "he sweat, as it were, great drops of blood, falling to the ground," he exclaimed, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Jehovah laid on him the iniquity of us all. "It pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief." (Isa. liii.) That was "the travail of his soul."

We are sometimes overwhelmed with horror when we think of the sins of men: what must have been the case with *him* when he had at once a perfect view of all the sins of the world, from the beginning to the end of time, with all their hatefulness to the Infinite Purity, all their insult to the Divine Majesty, all their liability to inexorable retribution, entailing untold miseries in this world, and in the world to come? Connected with this was the malice and wrath and rage of men and demons, the desertion of his friends, and the dereliction of divine comfort. It is appalling to think of what he endured.

O Lamb of God, was ever pain,
Was ever love, like thine.

There was, of course, no remorse, no self-accusation, no personal displeasure of his heavenly Father; indeed, the Father was never better pleased with the Son than when he was enduring all this agony to uphold the divine honor, and to save a world of sinners lost. He did not suffer the pains of the damned. How could he feel remorse, and a sense of God's wrath toward him, and eternal despair? Such a conception is blasphemous! He was not made a sinner when he was made a sin-offering—"he suffered *the just* for the unjust that he might bring us to God."

The higher and holier the nature of the sufferer, the more exquisite is the suffering. The lowest kind of animals seem to have but little sensibility—they suffer but little. Inferior human

beings, following the analogy, do not suffer like higher natures. Some seem to suffer but little from lesions of the body and other

physical evils. Base natures suffer but little from mental ailments. Some indeed scarcely know what we mean by mental anguish. But Christ possessed a body that had never been degraded by vice, and hence was finely strung in its nervous organization, and liable to extreme suffering. He possessed a soul that was "spotless, sincere, without offense." The moral perceptions had never been obtunded by any obliquity, and every faculty was in the highest state of development, and so capable of exquisite pleasure and of excruciating pain. "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer."

§ 3. Christ Was Crucified.

It behooved him to suffer by crucifixion, and he was crucified. This indeed was not *ex necessitate rei*. There was no such virtue in crucifixion that Christ could not have accomplished our salvation by any other mode of death. The sin of man is not necessary to the accomplishment of God's holy and benevolent purposes. Christ could have accomplished our redemption without the treason of Judas [the cowardice of Pilate], the malice of the Jews, or the cruelty of the Romans. The *circumstances* of Christ's passion were necessary in verification of the predictions concerning him; but then these circumstances, properly speaking, were the cause of the predictions which are their anticipated history. Had it been foreseen that Christ would suffer in any other way, the types and prophecies concerning him would have been accommodated to it.

The intended sacrifice of Isaac, who bore the wood for the fire with which he was to be consumed, is adduced as a type of Christ bearing his cross to Calvary. (Gen. xxii.) The lifting up of the brazen serpent on the pole is also viewed as a type of the crucifixion. (Num. xxi. 9; John iii. 14.) The paschal lamb, a bone of which was not to be broken, is also considered a type of Christ, in whose crucifixion there was no fracture of a bone; though *crurifragium* was common in the crucifixion of criminals in Judea to hasten their death—to please the Jews, whose law did not allow the body of a man to hang at night on a tree. (Ex. xii. 46; Deut. xxi. 22, 23; John xix. 31–36.) It was also said prophetically of the Messiah in Ps. xxii. 16: "They

pierced my hands and my feet," which was fulfilled by nailing him to the cross. (John xix. 25–27.) Zechariah also prophesied, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced." (Zech. xii. 10.) In fulfillment of this, without any design on his part, "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." John bears a very emphatic testimony to the fact, having been an eye-witness of it, and referring to the prophecy of Zechariah concerning it. (John xix. 34–37.) That which is specially to be noted in this matter is that crucifixion was not a Jewish mode of punishment, but a Roman. Hence when our Lord predicts his death he says: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again." (Matt. xx. 18, 19.) And again, "Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified." (Matt. xxvi. 2.) And so it proved. If the Jews had put him to death under forms of law it would have been by stoning; but the power of life and death was taken from them, and providence would not allow them to assassinate the Saviour. (Luke xiii. 32, 33; John x. 17, 18.) He is not to be put to death except in such a way as will demonstrate his innocence, show the sacrificial character of his death, and insure a perfect attestation of his resurrection when that should take place.

The details of his betrayal, apprehension, trial by Jews and Romans, condemnation, execution, burial, and resurrection, leave no room to doubt concerning any of these points. Jewish and Roman writers, moreover, corroborate the main particulars of this history. None ever doubted the fact of his crucifixion except the Phantastics, as the *Docetae* are significantly called. Mahomet, indeed, in the Koran, says that Jesus was withdrawn and a Jew was crucified in his place; but no one of common sense pays any attention to so stupid a story.

Thus, as Bishop Pearson states this important item of our Creed:

> I am really persuaded and fully satisfied that the only begotten and eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancel the handwriting which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of

a servant, and in that form did willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custom, to the cross; and upon that did suffer servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain, and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. And thus I believe in Christ crucified.

§ 4. Christ Was Dead.

As already stated, it is said that Christ was dead, as well as crucified, because he might have been crucified and not have been dead. He might have swooned, or gone into an asphyxia, and so have been taken down from the cross as dead; or he might have wrought a miracle and saved himself, as his enemies tauntingly challenged him to do, and have come down from the cross a live man. But the testimonies as to his death are too numerous, minute, varied, and emphatic to allow of the shadow of a doubt. He came into the world to die, and die he did. He yielded to the murderous cruelty of his enemies, and they "killed the Prince of life." The violence to which he was subjected, and the mental anguish which he experienced, would kill any man unless a miracle were wrought to prevent it; and as his hour was come no such miracle was wrought; and he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;" "It is finished." "And he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." (Luke xxiii. 46; John xix. 30.) And when the soldiers came to examine him and the two robbers who were crucified with him, they found the robbers still alive, and gave them the *coup de grace*, the *crurifragium*, which hastened their death. "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water." (John xix. 31–37.) If he had not been dead before, this puncture of the pericardium and the heart would have killed him instantly. Pilate received from the centurion who had charge of the crucifixion assurance of the death of Jesus before he gave permission for the removal of his body.

There is nothing better substantiated in all history than the reality of the Saviour's death; so that we may confess with Bishop Pearson:

> I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and

fundamental truth, that the only begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly die, so

as, by the force and violence of those torments which he felt, his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ that was crucified and dead.

§ 5. Christ Was Buried.

It is added in the Confession and in the Creed: "And buried." Thus Paul in his concise symbol: "For I delivered unto you, first of all, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; aud that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.) Though the apostle does not here say that he was buried according to the Scriptures, unless he intended this clause to refer to both facts—his burial as well as his resurrection—yet his burial was as clearly predicted as his resurrection—as in Ps. xvi. 10, where the soul in *sheol* means the life in the grave, as the next clause explains, "neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." So Isa. liii. 9: "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." In what a precise and remarkable manner this prediction was fulfilled, we have a detailed account in the Gospels: "Joseph of Arimathea (being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews) besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus, and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore and took the body of Jesus. And there came also Nicodemus (which at the first came to Jesus by night), and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulcher, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparation day, for the sepulcher was nigh at hand." (John xix. 38-42.) How strange that the rich counselor should have a garden near Calvary, and in it a new tomb hewn out of a rock in which was never man laid, and that the body of Jesus, with due funeral rites, should be buried in

that tomb, so that there could be no possibility of collusion, delusion, or illusion! Dead he was therefore, and buried; and he remained in the state of death until he rose triumphant from the grave. His burial is therefore a part of his humiliation, and one of the great facts of redemption, as it makes the assurance of his death and resurrection doubly

sure. It is not without reason, therefore, that it is put into the Creeds and the Confession, and also into that most affecting suffrage of the Litany: "By thine agony and bloody sweat; by thy cross and passion; by thy precious death and burial—good Lord, deliver us." Says Pearson:

> Thus I believe the only begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation deposited in a sepulcher hewn out of the rock, in which never man was laid before, and by rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ was buried.

On the clause in the Apostle's Creed, "dead and buried," the Catechism of the Council of Trent says:

> It is not without just reason that this is proposed as a separate and distinct object of belief. There were some who denied his death upon the cross. The apostles,[2] therefore, were justly of opinion, that to such an error should be opposed the doctrine of faith contained in the Article of the Creed, the truth of which is placed beyond the possibility of doubt, by the concurring testimony of all the evangelists, who record that Jesus "yielded up the ghost." Moreover, as Christ was true and perfect man, he, of course, was also capable of dying, and death takes place by a separation of the soul from the body. When, therefore, we say that Jesus died, we mean that his soul was disunited from his body; not that his divinity was so separated. On the contrary, we firmly believe and profess that, when his soul was dissociated from his body, his divinity continued always united both to his body in the sepulcher, and to his soul in Limbo. It became the Son of God to die, "that through death he might destroy him who had the empire of death—that is to say, the devil—and might deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to servitude."
>
> It was the peculiar privilege of the Redeemer to have died when he himself decreed to die, and to have died, not so much by external violence as by internal assent; not only his death, but also its time and place, were ordained by him, as we learn from these words of Isaias: "he was offered

because it was his own will."

223

The Redeemer, before his passion, declared the same of himself: "I lay down my life," says he, "that I may take it again. No man taketh it away from me; but I lay it down of myself, and I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." As to time and place, when Herod insidiously sought the life of the Saviour, he said: "Go, and tell that fox: behold I cast out devils, and perform cures this day and to-morrow, and the third day I am consummate. But yet I must walk this day, and to-morrow, and the day following, because it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." He, therefore, offered himself not involuntarily or by external coaction; but of his own free will. Going to meet his enemies, he said, "I am he," and all the punishments which injustice and cruelty inflicted on him he endured voluntarily.

But if, when we confess that he was buried, we make this, as it were, a distinct part of the article, it is not because it presents any difficulty, which is not implied in what we have said of his death; for believing, as we do, that Christ died, we can also easily believe that he was buried. The word "buried" was added in the creed, first, that his death may be rendered more certain, for the strongest proof of a person's death is the interment of his body; and, secondly, to render the miracle of his resurrection more authentic and illustrious.

There were many "honorable" things connected with the humiliation of Christ—indeed, the miracles which were wrought by him when in Gethsemane and for him when on the cross—the testimony of the penitent robber, and of the centurion, as before of Pilate, were all "honorable to Jesus," but still they belonged to his state of humiliation;[3] and so did his burial, notwithstanding he was laid with decent solemnities in the rich man's tomb. His burial was the complement of his death: the proof that he was really dead. Hence the Catechism is right in placing last among the items of his humiliation, "his being buried and continuing under the power of death for a season." It is surprising that Knapp should think otherwise. Pearson shows that the burial of Christ was represented typically and foretold prophetically; that it took place providentially and was accomplished punctually, in the most honorable way according to Jewish custom: thus we have an assurance of his death preceding and his resurrection following—a model or type of our mystical burial (Col. ii. 12; Rom. vi. 4), and a precedent and example for the honorable sepulture of all the saints.

1. After the discovery of the Pilate stone in Caesarea Maritima, 1961, Pilate was restored to his proper title of *Praefectus*, a military governor of a province, backing (and monitoring) a local, civil government, most notably Herod Antipas. Pilate was the last full Prefect of Judea; one more succeeded him, but was replaced shortly by the first Procurator of Judea.—*somercet*↩
2. The Church of Rome, in defiance of all historical and critical canons, holds fast the apostolic origin of the so-called Apostles' Creed. The concluding words of the preface to the Tridentine Catechism are these: "The first, then, and most important points of Christian faith are those which the holy apostles, the great leaders and teachers of the faith, men inspired by the Holy Ghost, have divided into the twelve articles of the Creed: for as they had received a command from the Lord to go forth 'into the whole world,' as his embassadors, and preach the gospel to every creature, they thought proper to compose a form of Christian faith, 'that all may speak and think the same thing;' and that amongst those whom they should have called to the unity of faith, no schisms should exist; but that they should be perfect in the same mind and in the same spirit. This profession of Christian faith and hope, drawn up by themselves, the apostles called a 'symbol,' either because it was an aggregate of the combined sentiments of all, or because, by it, as by a common sign and watch-word, they might easily distinguish false brethren, deserters from the faith, 'unawares brought in,' 'who adultered the word of God,' from those who had pledged an oath of fidelity to serve under the banner of Christ."—T.↩
3. Theologians in general treat of the work of Christ under the twofold division of his "Estate of Humiliation" and his "Estate of Exaltation." This method of treatment does not coincide with the order and form of statement adopted in the articles: it is obvious, however, that all the topics of the preceding chapter belong to Christ's "Estate of Humiliation."—T.↩

Chapter II. Scriptural Doctrine of Reconciliation and Sacrifice.

§ 1. Design of Christ's Humiliation.

224

The design of Christ's humiliation, beginning with his incarnation in the womb of the Virgin, and ending with his burial in the womb of the earth, is here stated: "To reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

Reconciliation implies previous hostility. The antagonism between God and man was occasioned by the sins of the latter; which, being an offense against all the attributes of God, all the principles of his moral government, and the interests of all the subjects of his empire, forced God to withdraw his favorable regards from the sinning race. Without this grand expedient the first offenders would have been summarily dealt with, and not allowed to propagate their species in their fallen and depraved state. But the merciful provision being made—to be developed in the fullness of time—the gracious charter comprehended pardon and grace for all actual sins, as well as for original sin: that is to say, not only was salvation provided for the primeval transgressors, but also for all their posterity, who are involved, by their prevarication, in sin and misery.

Adam's descendants were begotten in his own likeness morally as well as physically and mentally—as is set forth in Article VII. This corruption of their nature is not charged upon their posterity till they indorse it by actual transgression; hence the sacrifice of Christ is for both original and actual sins.

It would have been no mercy to our race, but a great calamity, if the sacrifice had been restricted to original sin; for with a fallen nature every descendant of Adam would have been sure to commit actual sin had there been no provision made to prevent it, and then he must have been punished for it, as there would have been no provision made for its pardon. And if by

225

the atonement our first parents had been restored to their pristine

innocence and integrity, and had propagated their species in that state, they would have been liable to fall from it, and certain death would have been the consequence. But in the covenant of redemption provision is made for the salvation of every sinner from every sin, while “the bland, the mediatorial hour” remains, on the reasonable and easy condition of repentance, faith, and plighted obedience.

§ 2. Christ a Sacrifice.

The grand consideration on which this salvation is offered is the sacrifice of Christ, or rather Christ himself viewed as a sacrifice. He is called in the article “a sacrifice;” and this word is used in the sense of a piacular, expiatory, propitiatory, atoning oblation. It embraces the twofold idea of satisfaction and substitution. To satisfy the divine claims there must be suffering and death: to release the offender who deserves punishment, the suffering, or its equivalent, is transferred to another, who is solemnly devoted and put to death instead of the offender. Thus the sacrifice is expiatory, as it is offered for sin; and it is vicarious, because it is offered for the sin of another.

§ 3. Patriarchal and Mosaic Sacrifices.

Animals, as well as inanimate objects, were indeed offered as eucharistic sacrifices; but in this case expiatory sacrifices were presupposed, as no thank-offering was accepted from a sinner who had not offered sacrifice in atonement for his sin. Hence Cain’s offering of the fruits of the earth was rejected, not because the *minchah*, or thank-offering, which he presented was improper in itself, but because he had not, with penitence and faith, offered an expiatory sacrifice for his sin. Abel’s offering was accepted because it was of this character. “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh.” (Heb. xi. 4.) Abel doubtless offered a eucharistic sacrifice; but “he also brought of the firstling of his flock, and of the fat thereof; and the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering”

(Gen. iv. 4), because it prefigured “the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” (John i. 29.)

In like manner the patriarchs offered animal sacrifices to God,

and that by divine appointment. (Gen. xv. 9–11.) Animal sacrifices constituted a prominent feature in the Mosaic economy—according to which “without shedding of blood is no remission.” (Heb. ix. 22.) In the Epistle to the Hebrews—the Leviticus of the New Testament—is a luminous commentary on the sacrificial system of the Mosaic dispensation, which is declared to be “a shadow of good things to come.” “For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin are burnt without the camp; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.” “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.”

§ 4. The New Testament Doctrine.

The New Testament is full of this doctrine. Christ himself says, “The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many.” (Matt. xx. 28.) Λύτον means a price paid for the deliverance of captives condemned to death: here the price is the life or blood of Christ, offered for the deliverance of men from spiritual death. It is the word used in the Septuagint to render the Hebrew word which we translate “redemption” in Lev. xxv. 24, 51; and the word rendered “ransom” in Ex. xxx. 12; and “satisfaction” in Num. xxxv. 31, 32. With this use of the word the writers of the New Testament were familiar. Paul says: “There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.” (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) Here the compound word, ἀντίλυτρον, is used, which means “a correspondent ransom.” Hyperius well says: “It properly signifies a price by which captives are redeemed from the enemy, and that kind of exchange in which the life of one is redeemed by the life of another.” Aristotle uses the verb ἀντίλυτρέω) for redeeming life by life. Canaanites and other heathen nations of antiquity, the Aztecs and other modern nations, offered human sacrifices to propitiate their deities. So did the Gauls, of whom Caesar writes that they did it on the ground that “the anger of the immortal gods could be no otherwise appeased than by

paying the life of one man for that of another"—a sad perversion of the primitive doctrine of satisfaction and substitution. When our Lord instituted the Supper which is to be observed through all time in remembrance of his death, he said, "This bread is"—that is, represents—"my body which is given for

you. This cup is"—represents—"my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

John the Baptist, speaking in the well-known Jewish idiom, points to Christ and says: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" (John i. 29, 36.) Peter says, "Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Peter i. 18, 19), alluding to the provision of the Levitical law that no imperfect victim was to be offered in sacrifice. In the Revelation Christ is frequently called "the Lamb"—twenty-eight times, always ἀρνίον, not ἀμνός, as in John i. 29, 36. (*Cf.* Acts viii. 32; 1 Pet. i. 19.) He is so called in view of his sacrificial character—*e. g.*, "worthy is the Lamb that was slain;" "These are they that have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Lambs were to be offered daily, and additional ones weekly, monthly, yearly, and on special occasions. The lamb, by its innocence and patience and intrinsic worth, was a fit emblem of him who was "spotless, sincere, and without offense." (Isa. liii. 7; Acts viii. 32–35.) Thus Cowper sings:

The paschal sacrifice,
And blood-besprinkled door.
Seen with enlightened eyes,
And once applied with power,
Would teach the need of other blood
To reconcile an angry God.

The lamb, the door, set forth
His perfect innocence,
Whose blood of matchless worth
Should be the soul's defense;
For he who can for sins atone
Must have no failings of his own.

The apostle says: "He hath made him to be sin"—or a sin-offering—"for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the

righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) So Peter: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." (1 Pet. ii. 22–24; iii. 18.) Here is the idea of satisfaction—suffered for

(περὶ) sins; and the idea of substitution—the just for (ὑπὲρ) the unjust; and reconciliation—in order that he might (ἵνα) bring us to God.

The bearing of sins may refer to that most solemn of all the Mosaic ordinances, the fast of expiation, or the Day of Atonement. On the tenth day of the seventh month a general atonement was to be made for the sins of the whole nation. The high-priest was to offer a ram for a burnt-offering; also a bullock and a goat as sin-offerings, the one for himself and the other for the people. Having sprinkled their blood before the mercy-seat, another goat was taken, and, laying both hands on his head, the priest was to confess over him all the iniquities and all the transgressions and all the sins of the people, thus symbolically transferring them to the goat, which was to be sent away into the wilderness, thus, as it were, bearing off all their sins in his own body. The ceremony of the scape-goat—as he is for that reason called—is a continuation of that of the goat slain for a sin-offering, showing the effect of that sacrifice, the removal of the people's sin.

The scape-goat on his head
The people's trespass bore,
And, to the desert led,
Was to be seen no more:
In him our Surety seemed to say,
"Behold, I bear your sins away!"

It must not be forgotten that this ceremony of expiation was connected with the solemnity of fasting—afflicting their souls in token of their repentance—as no impenitent person can exercise faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, so as to be saved thereby.

Paul says: "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14.) "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. iii.

24; *cf.* Heb. ix. 15.) In these places the word is ἀπολύτρωσις which means literally, "a letting off for a ransom"—redemption or deliverance on account of a ransom paid. Though this idea is sometimes dropped in the use of the word, as in Luke xxi. 28, yet in these passages the ransom price is specified, ἀπολύτρωσις can be nothing less than "redemption from the power and consequences of sin through Christ, who gave his life as a ransom."

Paul develops the thought when he says, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare

his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God—to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 25, 26.) There is no sense in this passage if it does not teach that Christ's death is sacrificial—expiatory and substitutional. The word rendered "propitiation" is ἱλαστήριον, propitiatory, expiatory, and, as here used, as a substantive, a propitiatory sacrifice. In the Septuagint it is used for the mercy-seat, or the cover of the ark, over which was the shekinal glory, together with the wings of the cherubim. On this golden lid of the sacred chest which contained the tables of the law, once a year, as we have seen, the high-priest sprinkled the blood of atonement. (Ex. xxv. 17–22; Lev. xvi. 13–16.) These symbols were designed to teach that there can be no forgiveness for breaking the law but by atonement, and that the law cannot be kept except by the "sanctification of the Spirit and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." To this Paul makes a fine allusion in Heb. ix., where he speaks of the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat, etc. Here the word is the same, ἱλαστήριον. It comes from ἱλασκομαι, "to reconcile one's self to any one by expiation, to propitiate." It is the word used in Heb. ii. 17: "That he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people"—that is, "to propitiate as to sins, to make propitiation for sins."

The word ἱλασμος comes from the same verb, and means propitiation, expiation, and is used—abstract for concrete—in 1 John ii. 2: "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins;

and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." (1 John iv. 10.) [In this last passage the same term is employed.[1]]

230

We challenge all the Socinians in the world to furnish terms in any language which shall set forth the idea of piacular sacrifice, satisfaction, or propitiation, if these passages do not.[2] The terms are varied with an eloquent and emphatic affluence, and associated with such expressions, and employed in such connections, as to make it apparently impossible to mistake their import. They abundantly warrant us in the use of the language of this article, and that of Article XX.: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual"—as well as that of the Communion Service: "Almighty God, and Heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

---

1. On these passages the Rev. Alfred Cave, in his "Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice," p. 283, remarks: "Ἱλασμικός is the important word. It does not often occur in the LXX., but in one place it is the synonym of *asham* or trespass-offering, in another of *chattath* or sin-offering, in another of *kippurim* or atonement, and in two others of *selichah* or remuneration."—T.↩
2. The sacrificial teachings of both the Old and New Testaments have been exhaustively investigated, with abundant scholarship, by the Rev. Alfred Cave, B.A., in his "Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice." Professor George Smeaton, D.D., of the New College, Edinburgh, pursuing similar methods of critical exegesis, has produced two admirable volumes: "Our Lord's Doctrine of the Atonement," and "The Apostles' Doctrine of the Atonement." These three volumes (published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh) may fairly be said to embody the results of the best recent scholarship as to the exact form and purport of the Biblical declarations. Mr. Cave's summation (p. 324) is in this language: "This, then, is the New Testament Doctrine of Atonement, that he whose office it had ever been to

reveal the mind of the Father, and who had assumed human form, having passed through this mortal life without sin, and being therefore non-amenable to any penalty decreed upon transgression, had voluntarily submitted to that curse of death, with all its mystery of meaning, which he had himself announced, and thereby rendered the forgiveness of sins possible to man."—T.↩

Chapter III. Extent of the Atonement.

§ 1. Scripture Proofs of Universal Atonement.

231

That the sacrifice of Christ in its atoning virtue is as "wide as the reach of Satan's rage" is clear from the scriptures which we have cited, to which scores besides might be added—*e. g.*, "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." (Rom. v. 18.) "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all." (1 Tim. ii. 3–6.) "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." (Heb. ii. 9.)

§ 2. Critical Examination of 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

The universal extent of the fall in Adam and of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus is emphatically set forth by the apostle in 2 Cor. v. 14, 15: "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge: that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again." As the verb ἀπέθανον is the second aorist, Rotherham renders, "by consequence they all died."[1] So Webster and Wilkinson: "The all before-named for whom he died—*i. e.*, all mankind—therefore all died, in his death, not regarded as suffered imputatively by them, but regarded as the indication of

232

what was due to them: his death for all men was the condemnation of all men, as well as the source and ground of their salvation. See Rom. viii. 2." Socinians, Broad-churchmen, Mystics, and Antinomians favor that rendering: some because it disposes of a text cited for original sin, universal depravity; others because it disposes of a proof-text for universal atonement, as the passage plainly teaches that Christ died for as many as are indicated in this clause—that is, say the opponents of universal atonement, all the elect, who died by imputation in Christ; others, to seek some countenance for their exclusively subjective notion of the atonement. So Robertson: "If one died for all, then all died—if one did it for all, then all did it—therefore all are now dead to sin:" which is a transparent fallacy, a palpable contradiction of a lamentable fact. Despite the death of Christ, Paul says: "I was alive unto sin once"—and he did not die to it till his conversion. We are aware that many good modern critics [as Meyer and Whedon] sanction this rendering. But it is remarkable that it is found in none of the old versions.

The Rhemish renders the Vulgate, *ergo omnes mortui sunt*, "then all were dead," as Wycliffe had done before. Tomson, in his translation of Beza's New Testament, the Geneva, and Cranmer, all render, "then were all dead." So, for the grammar, if not for the sense, Whitby renders: "Then were all dead—*i. e.*, obnoxious to death, and condemned to it for sin." Similarly Macknight: "Certainly all were condemned to death." So John Goodwin ("Redemption Redeemed"): "Because we thus judge—*i. e.*, upon clear grounds and principles of reason, argue and conclude—that if one died for all men, then were all men dead—*i. e.*, obnoxious unto death, dead in law, as good as dead—otherwise they should not have had any need that another should die for their preservation." He says this interpretation is indorsed by "our best and most approved authors," specifically citing Chrysostom:

> Among the ancients, is Chrysostom generally esteemed, and that worthily, the best interpreter of the Scriptures. His sense of the place is plainly enough the same with ours; "For," saith he, writing upon the place, "he had not died—or would not have died—for all, had not all died, or been dead." In which words he clearly supposeth that Christ died for as many as were dead, and consequently for all, without exception, inasmuch as all, without exception or difference, were dead. A little after thus: "For it argueth an excess of much love, both to die for so great a world, and to die for it being so affected or disposed as it was."

We wonder Goodwin did not also cite Augustin, whose interpretation

is so much to the point, despite his partial system. He says ("City of God," B. XX.):

It is good for all men to hear his voice, and live, by passing to the life of godliness from the death of ungodliness. Of this death the Apostle Paul says: "Therefore all are dead, and he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again." Thus all, without one exception, were dead in sins, whether original or voluntary sins, sins of ignorance, or sins committed against knowledge; and for all the dead there died the one only Person who lived—that is, who had no sin whatever—in order that they who live by the remission of their sins should live not to themselves, but to him who died for all, for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that we, believing in him who justifies the ungodly, and being justified from ungodliness, or quickened from death, may be able to attain to the first resurrection which now is.

He thus clearly refers to the death of sin—not to death temporal or eternal, the consequence of sin, but to spiritual death, the moral state of all men who are dead in trespasses and sins—involving, of course, temporal and eternal death, unless it be removed by the salvation which Christ died to procure for all men, if they will only avail themselves of it. Similarly Watson ("Inst.," II. 25):

When St. Paul says, "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead," he argues the universality of spiritual death, from the universality of the means adopted for raising men to spiritual life: a plain proof that it was received as an undisputed principle in the primitive Church, that Christ's dying for all men has to be taken in its utmost latitude, or it could not have been made the basis of the argument.

Bloomfield has a judicious note to the same effect, only he slightly varies the rendering on grammatical grounds:

Almost all translators render "were dead." But to this version strong and well-founded objections are urged by Professor Scholef (in his "Hints," p. 50), who shows (1) that it involves a strange confusion of terms; (2) that it is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the apostle; and (3) that ἀπέθανον cannot signify "I was dead," but "I am dead." I would render "thus are all dead," as Col. iii. 3. The full meaning is, "Then are all by nature spiritually dead"—*i. e.*, in a state of condemnation, liable to eternal death; and, as it is implied, need to be brought into a state of salvation by the gospel.

It is surprising he did not quote Tyndale's rendering: "Because we thus judge, if one be dead for all, that then are all dead." In the next clause, however, Tyndale renders ἀπέθανεν, as in our version, "and that he died for all."

Tyndale probably had his eye on Luther's version: "For the love of Christ constraineth us, therefore since we hold that as one died for all, so are they all dead."

§ 3. Sixteen Conclusive Proofs of Universal Atonement.

234

But the arguments for this truth are many and resistless.

1. That Christ died for all men is evident from the solidarity of our species. He became incarnate in our common nature; hence he is "the Son of man"—the representative man—and by virtue of his atonement the race was perpetuated after its life was forfeited by the original transgression. Every man lives because of the atonement. Our very existence was procured through the sacrifice of Christ, which was made for every man.

2. All temporal blessings are bestowed by God through the mediation of Christ. They are all procured by his atonement. If God is loving unto every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works, it is because Christ pleads his merits for all our race, and procures, in addition to life, all things richly to enjoy; and being mediatorial blessings, they are designed to lead us to repentance, (Rom. ii. 4.)

3. As the Holy Ghost, in his economical offices, is bestowed upon men in consequence of the atonement, and as he is imparted to every man, whether he yields to his strivings or resists them—doing despite to the Spirit of grace—it is clear that every man is interested in the sacrificial death of Christ. (John xvi. 9–11; Acts. vii. 51; Heb. x. 29.)

4. As no man in the original state of total depravity has the power to think, feel, or do any thing good, without divine assistance; and as that assistance is offered to no man except through Christ; and as every man is conscious that he has the power to turn from sin to righteousness, it is clear that every man is interested in the sacrificial death of Christ. In other words, preventing grace given to every man demonstrates the redemption

of every man.

5. As "repentance is a grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby a sinner, from the sense of his sins, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth with grief and hatred to his sin turn from it to God, with full purposes of, and endeavors after, future obedience;" and as "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent," therefore all men are interested in the mercy of God in Christ. (Acts xvii. 30, 31.)

6. As all men are required to repent and believe the gospel; and as Jesus told the Jews, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John vi. 29); and as "he

that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16); it follows that all men are interested in the gospel, and in the salvation which it proclaims, otherwise they would be called to believe in a Saviour who never died for them, and be threatened with damnation for rejecting an atonement which was never made on their behalf.

7. As the gospel is good news for all people, because it proclaims a Saviour for all, there can be none for whom he did not die. However good the news might be to the elect, it could not be good news to the reprobate, who have no part nor lot in the matter. If some men and angels are predestinated unto life and others fore-ordained to everlasting death; if "none but the elect are redeemed by Christ, but the rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth and withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice;" as the Westminster Confession says; and if the number of the parties respectively be so definite that "it cannot be added unto or diminished"—it is cruel trifling with the reprobates to tell them that Christ hath died to reconcile his Father to them, and to be a sacrifice for their original guilt and actual sins; and to threaten them with damnation for not believing this is to threaten them with damnation for not believing a lie!

8. The resurrection at the last day will be effected by Christ, who has acquired the right to raise men by virtue of his mediation; for "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." (John v. 28, 29; 1 Cor. xv. 22.) But his mediation extends to none for

whom he did not die; as his death is the central idea of mediation, it follows therefore that he died for all.

9. As he is to be the Judge of all men, in view of his mediatorial office (John v. 22; Acts xvii. 31), he must have died for all men—as his mediation is nothing apart from his death. It will hardly be said that he will judge *all* men, because he died for a *few* men!

10. It is asked, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" The question is impertinent in the case of the reprobate, for whom no salvation is provided. (Heb. ii. 3.)

11. Christ complains, "Ye will not come to me that ye might

have life." (John v. 40.) How can they come if no grace be procured for them and offered to them? and why should they come, if there be no life provided for them? and there is neither the one nor the other apart from the sacrifice of Christ.

12. Paul speaks of apostates "who were once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and who fell away, rendering their repentance hopeless, seeing they crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." (Heb. vi. 4–6.) But how could they experience all this grace from which they apostatized if Christ never died for them? What is the blood of Christ to those for whom it was never shed? Does the Spirit sprinkle it upon the hearts of the reprobate?

13. Peter speaks of some who "denied the Lord that bought them, and brought upon themselves swift destruction." (2 Pet. ii. 1.) Did the Lord buy any except by his death? Would it be a sin for the reprobate to deny that Christ died for them, if he died only for the elect? Could any bring upon themselves swift destruction for denying a falsehood, and asserting a truth?

14. Would all men be invited and urged to come to the feast of love and the fountain of life, and be damned for not accepting the invitation, if no feast were spread, and no fountain opened, for them? Yet Isaiah says: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." (Isa. lv. 1.) And Christ in the parable says: "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in that my house may be filled." (Luke xiv. 23.) "And

the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." (Rev. xxii. 17.)

15. Would the inspired apostles "warn every man night and day with tears" (Acts xx. 31)? would they "preach Christ, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. i. 28)? would they say: "Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men—for the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge: that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto

him who died for them, and rose again;" "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God;" "We then as workers together with him beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain" (2 Cor. v., vi.)—would they use such language as this, based upon the declaration of Jehovah, "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked" (Ezek. xxxii. 11); and the invitation and assurance of the Saviour, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest;" "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (Matt. xi. 28; John vi. 37), and his command, "Preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi. 15), and the awful threatening, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" (2 Thess. i. 7–9); would they do all this, and say all this, if they were not absolutely certain that not one to whom their commission extended was shut out from the mercy of the Father, the merit of the Son, and the grace of the Holy Spirit?

16. If Christ did not die for all men, to atone for all sins, original and actual, the Bible is a book of riddles and conundrums which no ingenuity can solve, and of contradictions which no logic can reconcile.

Hence, if there be any passages which seem to limit the atonement, whether we can explain them or not is immaterial—though we find none which present any difficulty—as there is a

short and easy method to dispose of them. All our conceptions of God force us to the belief that he is without partiality and without hypocrisy; that he wishes the happiness of all his creatures; a thousand plain and unequivocal passages of Scripture corroborate these conceptions of God; therefore, if there be any which seem to contradict them, it is the part of common sense to conclude it is only because of our misunderstanding of them. We may not be able to explain them, but of one thing we are certain as we are of our existence, that they do not palpably contradict those plain and pointed passages which nobody can mistake, and which find an echo in the conscience and common sense of all.

---

1. Similarly the Revised Version gives a consistent rendering of the aorist, “because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died.”—T.↩

Chapter IV. Objections to the Atonement Answered.

238
But there are objections to the doctrine of reconciliation by the mediation of Christ, which must be met.

§ 1. Does the Atonement Reconcile God to Man?

Socinians urge that the apostle does not speak of reconciling the Father to us, but of reconciling us to the Father. “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.” “We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son.” (2 Cor. v. 19; Rom. V. 10.)

But this involves God’s reconciliation to us. “The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness of men.” (Rom. i. 18.) That wrath must be appeased—turned away from sinners. He must be reconciled to us—stand in a reconciling attitude toward us—before we can be reconciled to him.[1]

239
Whitby says the words κατακλλάττειν and κατακλλάγή “naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry and displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers.” So Watson:

> When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul, by becoming their adversary, they said: “Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?”—not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master? but how shall he remove his master’s anger against him? how shall he restore himself to his master’s favor? “If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught *against thee*”—not that thou hast aught against thy *brother*—“first be *reconciled* to thy brother”—that is, appease and conciliate him; so that the words in fact import, “See that thy brother be reconciled to thee,” since that which goes before is not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him.

All the attributes of the divine nature are against the sinner, and they all have to be *satisfied* in the way in which pardon is offered to him—and so God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, by showing himself ready to forgive the sinner on the

ground of the *satisfaction* made by the death of his Son, and on the condition of the sinner's penitent acceptance of the atonement or reconciliation.

§ 2. Sovereign Forgiveness.

But we are asked, What is the use of all this cumbrous machinery? Cannot God, as a sovereign, and the offended party, forgive sinners if they repent and ask his pardon, without the intervention of an atonement?[2]

Now, supposing this might do, if there were but the solitary sinner and his God—we do not say that it would do in that case, but we will suppose it might—what has that to do with this question? The sinner is not alone; he is a fellow-subject with millions of his own species, and multiplied millions of another race,

240

or other races, and "God, the offended God most high," is the governor of them all. If his legislation be of so little importance that his subjects can transgress with impunity—the legislator being invested with the prerogative of pardoning every offender, whenever he asks pardon, without any satisfaction to the law—such a disregard to the penalty would amount to the repeal of the precept; God would cease to be the King of the universe; his throne would be undermined; his subjects would sin without reserve and without remorse, and not an angel in heaven would be secure in the possession of his inheritance of innocence and bliss. But when the inhabitants of other worlds, as well as of our earth, see that sin is so exceeding sinful, and the law so exacting, that it cannot be forgiven except through the atonement of "the Eternal God's Eternal Son," they are impressed with a holy horror of sin, conceiving of it in its proper light, as the great curse and calamity of the universe. Thus Christ "makes peace through the blood of his cross," and so God by him "reconciles all things unto himself"—that is to say, by this expedient God is reconciled to men, and men to God and to all the holy and obedient and loyal subjects of the universal King.

§ 3. The Vinculum Between Christ's Sufferings and Our Pardon.

This meets the objection that we cannot see the *vinculum* which connects the sufferings of Christ with the pardon of sin. We can see it, and that very clearly; nothing is more obvious. We see plainly how God can forgive sinners in view of the sacrifice of Christ, when otherwise it would not be safe or legally possible to do so. That is the apostle's great argument in Rom. iii. 21–26: "The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God—to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

§ 4. The Innocent in the Place of the Guilty.

241

But it is objected that it is wrong to punish the innocent for the guilty. So it is, if the innocent object to the substitution; but not otherwise. Within certain limits, and for certain ends, God permits one man to lay down his life for another. "We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren," when an imperative reason demands. In the case in question our Lord Jesus Christ offered himself a willing victim—his sacrifice would not have been meritorious—would not have been accepted—had he not offered it voluntarily. There was great merit in it, because he submitted to great humiliation, and underwent unparalleled sufferings; but there was no injustice in the case, as he voluntarily entered on the undertaking, which was approved by his heavenly Father; and "he sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied"—"for the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." (Heb. xii. 2.) Socinians eulogize the Saviour for doing and suffering so much for the benefit of men, and do not accuse God of cruelty or injustice in exposing him to all this, when he was, according to them, a perfectly innocent man; and how does the element of satisfaction, or expiation, effected by his

sufferings involve any injustice in his voluntary subjection to them?

§ 5. The Divine Benevolence in Atonement.

But then it is asked, “Where is the divine benevolence in all this?” Where, indeed? “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son” for its redemption. “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” (John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 11.) It surely was amazing love on the part of the Father that he should make such wonderful provision for our happiness through the mediation of his Son. It was not to promote any selfish ends that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. The Divine Beatitude is infinite, and so cannot be increased or diminished. It was to gratify his benevolence toward our fallen race that he manifested his perfections in harmony in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ; and “hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.” (1 John iii. 16.)

§ 6. Universalism.

242

But it is objected that if the sacrifice of Christ is expiatory and vicarious, and if it was offered for all sins, original and actual, then no sinner is liable to punishment; hence universalism is true.

And so it is, if the proposition be understood in the Antinomian sense. If the atonement were a commercial transaction; if the active and passive obedience of Christ were imputed to those for whom he lived and died, and if he lived and died for all—then, indeed, the law would have no claim upon the sinner. So far as he would be concerned, the precept would be repealed, and the penalty canceled. Neither repentance, faith, nor obedience, could be justly demanded of him, nor could he be subjected to the penalty of transgression. But this is not the case. Christ did not perform the duties God requires of us; nor did he suffer the punishment in kind and degree due to our sins. Both conceptions are absurd and impious. Christ was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; and by the merit of that obedience we are justified when we

penitently receive the atonement. There is only one element in the whole transaction which can be likened to the canceling of a debt: We are indeed indebted to God's justice by reason of our sins, and when God, for Christ's sake, forgives us our sins that debt is canceled. But this does not involve the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us. "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, by faith, and not by our own works or deservings." We are condemned to death, but we are graciously reprieved for the sake of Christ; but neither God nor we can imagine that Christ's innocence is transferred to us: that is a pure fiction. The Bible never speaks of any thing being imputed to a man but that which belongs to him; hence, in this matter of justification, "his faith," not the holiness of Christ, "is imputed unto him for righteousness." But that only stays the penalty for the sins that are past through the forbearance of God; and not even that absolutely and irreversibly—for as the pardon is acquired by repentance and faith, so it is retained by faith and obedience. Let unbelief and sin be cherished, and the act of pardon is canceled. "When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall die thereby." (Ezek. xxxiii. 18.) So the unmerciful

servant in the parable, who had been forgiven his ten thousand talents debt, had his indebtedness again entered on the debit side of his account; and Christ does not leave us in any doubt as to the application: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." (Matt. xviii. 35.)

As there is no imputation of Christ's active obedience, so there is no imputation of his passive obedience. It is not as if Christ was made a sinner for us—the thought is impious and absurd—nor that, being innocent, he suffered the full desert of our sins, both in kind and degree—that too is absurd and impious. How could an eternity of suffering due to every one of millions of millions of sinners be endured by Christ in the short space of eighteen hours; or, if you please, three or three and thirty years? Then, how could he with whom the Father was always well pleased—and especially well pleased when he was suffering the greatest agonies for our sins—be the object of his Father's wrath? How could he experience hate and despair and remorse, which constitute the bitterest ingredients in

the misery of the damned? What he suffered was very different from all this, as we have seen. Therefore, as there was no imputation of our sin, in the proper sense, so there was no endurance of our punishment, in the proper sense, and no transfer of his obedience, active or passive, as if we had performed the one and endured the other. Hence there is still place for God's forgiving mercy and sanctifying grace, still a demand for the performance of conditions—viz., repentance and faith, on which mercy and grace may be bestowed—still the necessity of obedience to the divine law or the endurance of its penalty. Christ's merits are available to us for the pardon of past sins, only on condition of our repentance and faith; and for eternal salvation, only as through his grace we "bring forth the fruits of righteousness, which are by Christ Jesus to the glory and praise of God."[1]

---

1. Bishop Martensen ("Christian Dogmatics," pp. 303, 304) states this point with great lucidity and power: "The idea of atonement may accordingly he defined as the solution of a certain antithesis in the very life of God as revealed to man, or of the apparent opposition between God's love and God's righteousness. Though these attributes are essentially one, yet sin has produced a tension or apparent variance between these two points in the divine mind. Though God eternally loves the world, his actual relation to it is not a relation of love, but of holiness and justice, a relation of opposition, because the unity of his attributes is hindered and restrained. There exists also a contradiction between the actual and essential relations of God to mankind; a contradiction which can only be removed by the destruction of the interposing principle of sin. The expression, the *wrath of God*, simply embodies this truth, that the relations of God's love to the world are unsatisfied, unfulfilled. The expression is not merely anthropopathic, it is an appropriate description of the divine pathos necessarily involved in the conception of a revelation of love restrained, hindered, and staid through unrighteousness. For this wrath is holy love itself, feeling itself so far hindered because they have turned away from its blessed influence whom it would have received into its fellowship. This restrained manifestation of love, which in one aspect of it may be designated wrath, in another aspect is called *grief* or *distress*, in the Holy Spirit of love; and wrath is thus turned into compassion. It is only when the wrath of God is allowed that any mention can be made of his compassion. That heathen

antiquity had no idea of God's love is attributable to the fact that it had no living conviction of the world's being under God's wrath. Plato and Aristotle rise only to the bare representation of God as a jealous God; and men who in our day speak of dispassionate love rise no higher than they. The Old Testament, on the contrary, speaks of the wrath of God, who is 'a consuming fire,' in the Psalms and in the Prophets, almost on every page; but it speaks also of the tender mercy and grace of the Lord, and of his love as like a mother's!"—T.↩

2. We once asked a highly intelligent Jew if he did not feel the need of a mediator in coming to God. He stretched himself to his height—and he was a tall man—as we might have imagined one of the old Pharisees would have done, and said with vehemence, "What use have I for a mediator? If I offend against my heavenly Father, and ask his forgiveness, will he not forgive me?"↩
3. The various points in this article are well analyzed in Sec. IV. of the Catechism, and appropriate scriptural proofs are adduced.↩

Chapter V. Erroneous Views of the Atonement.

244

In expounding this part of the article we have necessarily anticipated and we hope refuted, some of the leading errors on the atonement; but it may be expedient to treat this subject in a more systematic manner.

§ 1. The Gnostic Theory.

The first divergence from the scriptural and catholic doctrine of the atonement is the Gnostic theory.

The Gnostics denied the expiatory and vicarious character of the sufferings of Christ. Basilides held that penal suffering implies personal criminality; but Christ was an innocent person, therefore his sufferings were not penal; and vicarious suffering in reference to justice is untenable; and as Christ's sufferings were merely human, they could not atone for the sins of the whole world. Marcion held substantially the same view, because, though he affirmed a divine suffering in the Redeemer, yet it was only apparent, as the *Logos* assumed only a spectral, docetic body. His suffering was merely emblematical, teaching that man must die to the earthly life in order to secure the heavenly. So the Ebionites held that there was no more connection between God and man in the person of Christ than that which obtains in the case of any other man. The Gnostics held fantastic notions about the *Demiurge*—a fancied being, neither God nor devil, that made the material world, founded the Jewish system, and opposed the *Logos*, contriving his death; in which, however, the *Demiurge* was circumvented and disappointed in his malignant purpose. It is useless to rebut such jargon.

§ 2. The Mythical, or "Satan," Theory.

The next great divergence from orthodoxy is found in the peculiar teaching of the Alexandrian school, and is known as the mythical, or "the Satan," theory. Clement, Origen, and others of

that school, though opponents of Gnosticism, broached a theory near akin to it, and equally absurd. Origen, in particular,

245

seems to have held all kinds of views on this subject—orthodox and heterodox—for consistency must not be looked for in his erratic writings. But the notion that the atonement was a ransom paid to the devil for the deliverance of man from his dominion was clearly held by him. Indeed, the devil figures very largely in the patristic writings of that age and the two succeeding centuries. Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 370) held that "Men have come under the dominion of the devil by sin. Jesus offered himself to the devil as the ransom for which he should release all others. The crafty devil assented, because he cared more for the one Jesus, who was so much superior to him, than for all the rest. But, notwithstanding his craft, he was deceived, since he could not retain Jesus in his power. It was, as it were, a deception on the part of God, that Jesus veiled his divine nature, which the devil would have feared, by means of his humanity, and thus deceived the devil by the appearance of flesh." It is humiliating indeed to record such puerile *diablery* as this, set forth by the Fathers of the Church. It is needless to say that they advanced no arguments in its support that deserve any notice. We are disposed to walk backward and cover the nakedness of our ancestors. But it is more mortifying still when we find vestiges of these patristic superstitions in our day. Christ does not indeed pay a ransom to the devil for the deliverance of the captives held by him; but he goes down into hell to deliver the captives there confined in prison by the devil, and to triumph over him in his own dominions. We need not say that such grotesque notions have no warrant in Holy Writ. Christ has made peace by the blood of his cross. He offered himself without spot to God.

I sing my Saviour's wondrous death:
He conquered when he fell;
"'Tis finished," said his dying breath,
And shook the gates of hell.

§ 3. The Expediential Theory.

The absurdity of "the Satan theory" was seen by later Fathers;

but unfortunately some of them went to the opposite extreme. They devised the expediential theory—a distortion of the governmental aspect of the atonement—"relaxation" rather than propitiation, which has been imputed to Grotius as its author. Thus Gregory Nazianzen says:

246

> We were under the power of the Evil One, since we had sold ourselves to sin, and had received in exchange the lust for iniquity. If, now, a ransom is given only to the one who has possession of the thing to be ransomed, then I ask, to whom was the price of ransom given? To the Evil One himself? Shame on the rash thought! Then the robber would receive not only from God, but God himself as a ransom and rich reward for his tyranny. Or is the ransom paid to the Father? But here the question arises, in the first place, why should it be? for God is not the being who is forcibly retaining us in his power. And, in the second place, what reason can be assigned why the Father should take delight in the blood of his only begotten Son? Since he did not even accept Isaac who was offered to him by his father Abraham, but changed the sacrifice of a rational being into that of an animal? Or is it not plain that the Father received the ransom, not because he himself required or needed it, but for the sake of the divine government of the universe (δι᾽οἰκονομίαν), and because man must be sanctified through the incarnation of the son of God?

What logic! What confusion of ideas! Gregory ignores the satisfaction made to the divine perfections by the atonement, which is the very kernel of the doctrine. The atonement is not a mere expedient of government: a point, as Watson says, to which Grotius leans too much. But, as the moral government of God is an expression of his moral character, Grotius did not deny that the atonement satisfied the subjective qualities of the latter, as well as the objective principles of the former. He wished to steer between the Calvinistic "commercial" theory, which leads to Antinomianism, and the Socinian theory, which resolves it all into mere metaphor. The atonement is an adequate compensation and full equivalent for the remission of punishment, not only because it maintains the honor of the divine law, while it gives free scope to the mercy of the Lawgiver, but because it satisfies all the divine perfections, as Grotius allows. Gregory Nazianzen, however, seems to have no conception of the true propitiatory character of the atonement, which is the more remarkable, as the Fathers who preceded him, and who were not tainted with "the Satan theory," recognized the essential satisfactory element of the atonement.[1]

§ 4. The Optional Theory.

The optional, or acceptilational, theory, usually credited to Duns Scotus as its author, may be traced to Augustin. He, indeed, had no fixed views on that, as he had not on scarcely any other subject. He sometimes seems to be orthodox on the atonement,

247

and at other times he favors the old patristic absurdity that the ransom was paid to the devil—*e. g.*, "God the Son, being clothed with humanity, subjugated even the devil to man, extorting nothing from him by violence, but overcoming him by the law of justice; for it would have been injustice if the devil had not had the right to rule over the being whom he had taken captive." What a notion! But in other places he advances the optional theory—*e. g.*, "They are foolish who say that the wisdom of God could not liberate men otherwise than by God's assuming humanity, being born of a woman, and suffering at the hands of sinners." And again: "When the question is asked whether there was no other way whereby God could liberate man than by his Son's becoming incarnate, and undergoing the suffering of death, it is not enough merely to say that this is a good way, but also to show, not that no other mode was in the power of him who can subject all things to his control, but that no more suitable mode could have been adopted." This implies that the wisdom of God might have devised, and the power of God executed, some other plan for man's recovery from sin and Satan.

Dr. Shedd well says:

> The necessity is made to depend ultimately upon the divine option. It is not founded in the divine nature, or in the attribute of justice. This theory, if logically carried out, conducts to the position of Origen, that God might by an act of mere will have constituted the sacrifice of bulls and goats a sufficient sacrifice for human guilt. But logic could not stop even at this point. For inasmuch as there is no absolute and metaphysical necessity of an atonement, and the whole provision for satisfying justice is resolved in the last analysis into an optional act on the part of God, it follows that, so far as the Divine Being is concerned, an atonement might be dispensed with altogether. For the same arbitrary and almighty will that was competent to declare the claims of justice to be satisfied by the finite sacrifice of bulls and goats would be competent also to declare that those claims should receive no satisfaction at all.

We have identified this theory with that of acceptilation. Duns Scotus borrowed this term from the Roman law. In the "Pandects of Justinian," says Shedd, it is defined "an acquittance from obligation by word of mouth, of a debtor by a creditor;" and it is called in the "Institutes of Justinian" "an imaginary payment." It does not belong to criminal, but to commercial, law. A creditor can *call* the debt paid, giving a receipt in full, when only a part or none of it has been actually paid by the debtor. This optional acceptance of nothing, or of

a part, for the whole debt, is called *acceptilation*. Duns Scotus transfers the term to theology, and says that God accepts the sacrifice of Christ, not because it is of infinite value, which he denied, but because God is willing to accept a satisfaction that is not strictly infinite. Any sacrifice is worth what God says it is worth. Its value is not intrinsic and real, but relative and optional.

It requires but little argument to show that this does not quadrate with the scriptural account of the sacrifice of Christ. Peter says: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 11, 12.) No other, no less (there could be no greater) sacrifice could be provided that would answer the purpose. He must take away sin by the sacrifice of himself. The perfections of God, the welfare of the universe, the interest of the human race—all alike demand the greatest sacrifice that God could provide, and there was no option left even to divine wisdom, power, and goodness, to accept of any other oblation than that of perfect humanity in personal unison with the infinite Godhead—no acceptilation expedient will answer the great ends of atonement. There must be, and there is, in Christ —in his sufferings and death—a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

§ 5. The Anselmic or Commercial Theory.

There is an extreme objective view of the atonement usually credited to Anselm, the most "orthodox" of the schoolmen. According to Neander, Anselm held the doctrine of an active,

vicarious satisfaction by Christ, but not that of a passive satisfaction, as he nowhere says that Christ endured the penalty of men's sins. He held that as Christ was both God and man, and, as man, was perfectly holy, he was not bound to die; but as he did voluntarily die, and as no equivalent could be given to him for making so great a sacrifice, the merit of it is made over to men for the forgiveness of their sin—the justice of God being satisfied by this expedient. He says that sin is a debt. Man owes to God obedience which he cannot render. Christ, as God-man, gives to the Deity more than the whole creation could render—"consequently

this divine-human obedience and suffering was a surplusage in respect to the man Christ Jesus, which overflows and inures to the benefit of the transgressors for whom it was voluntarily rendered." And, then, his theory is defective with regard to the appropriation of the merits of Christ by the believer.[2]

Anselm's theory is too exclusively objective. It paved the way for the commercial, or imputative, theory of the atonement, which holds so high a place in Calvinistic and Antinomian systems. Anselm accordingly is held in great esteem by Calvinistic writers, who set forth his views in the best style, and consider him the standard of orthodoxy. They, however, have modified his system, lopping off excrescences and grafting on other points to make it complete, and to adapt it to modern modes of thought.

The essential features are these: Man owes God a debt, which is twofold—a debt of suffering the penalty for past sin, and a debt of obedience, required by the precept. Christ pays that debt—the moiety of suffering, by enduring the full penalty of the law which man has broken; and the other moiety, of obedience, by the holiness of his life; and both the active and the passive righteousness of Christ are transferred and imputed to the sinner; and they are set down to his account as if he had rendered the one and suffered the other.

This is the logical development of the Anselmic theory of the atonement. It is grafted on the Calvinistic system of predestination, election, and reprobation, and, of course, leads to the rankest Antinomianism. If the atonement was made only for the elect, then not one of them can be lost, and not one of the reprobate can be saved. If the atonement, thus understood, was made for all men, then, as the Universalists hold, all men mast be saved—none can be

lost.

But in a previous section we have noticed and refated the peculiarities of this erroneous system. It would be a waste of time to refer to all its modifications by the schoolmen who followed that illustrious author, and the Calvinistic divines who defer so greatly to Anselm's opinions.

§ 6. The Abelardian, or Moral-subjective Theory.

250

But if Anselm gave an exaggerated view of the objective, legal aspect of the atonement, keeping the governmental and moral aspects in the background, or well-nigh out of sight, Abelard, who came after him, exaggerated the moral-subjective aspect, ignoring the objective, propitiatory view. Abelard declared the love of Christ the redeeming principle, as it calls forth love on our part. Dr. Shedd says:

> Abelard begins and ends with the benevolence of God. This is divorced from, and not limited by, his holiness, and is regarded as endowed with the liberty of indifference. The Deity can pardon upon repentance. There is nothing in the divine nature which necessitates a satisfaction for past transgression, antecedently to remission of penalty. Like creating out of nothing, redemption may and does take place by a *fiat*, by which sin is abolished by a word, and the sinner is received into favor. Nothing is needed but penitence in order to the remission of sin. The object of the incarnation and death of Christ, consequently, is to produce sorrow in the human soul. The life and sufferings of the God-man were intended to exert a moral impression upon a hard and impenitent heart, which is thereby melted into contrition, and then received into favor by the boundless compassion of God.
>
> Abelard attributes much to the intercessory agency of the Redeemer. As the God-man who has perfectly obeyed the divine law, Christ possesses a weight of influence with the Father which secures blessings for the sinful.
>
> Abelard denies the doctrine of satisfaction, and contends that God may remit the penalty by a sovereign act of will. The only characteristic which the theory of Abelard possesses in common with that of Anselm is its denial that the claims of Satan were satisfied by the death of the Redeemer. "If a slave," says Abelard, "should desert his master, his master could justly demand that he be given up. But if a slave should seduce his fellow-slave from obedience to the master of both of them, how absurd it would be for this slave to set up a claim to the services of the one whom he had

seduced!"

Peter Lombard sides with Abelard against Anselm in holding that "the influence of the death of Christ is spent upon the subjective character of the individual soul, in softening, subduing, and sanctifying." However, he adds that the sufferings of Christ, if supplemented by baptism and penance, may deliver man from the temporal penal consequences of sin. With this *addendum* Abelard's theory has found favor among the Romish divines.

As there seems to be no necessity for the incarnation of Deity in this system, the Socinians have eliminated that element. They admit that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; but not that Christ was himself God. By his consummate virtue, and by his martyr-death he could accomplish our redemption without any vicarious satisfaction, which, they say, is

incompatible with forgiveness. The work of atonement is exclusively subjective, as Abelard held; it effects the repentance and moral renovation of the sinner. His death ratified his doctrine, and is exemplary to his followers; it affords a pledge of forgiveness and of the resurrection, as he himself arose from the dead.

Without denying the incarnation of Deity—indeed, by putting it largely in the place of the satisfactory sufferings and death of Christ—many of the Broad-churchmen of the Anglican Church, and some of the Non-conformists, in like manner, "eviscerate the atonement of all meaning, except as a moral illustration or example." Thus Jowett: "The only sacrifice, atonement, or satisfaction with which the Christian has to do is a moral and spiritual one—not the pouring out of blood upon the earth, but the living sacrifice, 'to do thy will, O God,' in which the believer has part, as well as his Lord." Dr. Bushnell says: "The sacrifice and cross of Christ was his simple duty, and not any superlative, optional kind of good, outside of all the common principles of virtue." Christ, he says, did not satisfy by his own suffering the violated justice of God. He did not come into the world to die, but he died because he was here: there was nothing penal in the agony and the cross.

Rationalists of all classes—Christians, Jews, and deists—unite in this negative, moral-subjective system. They admire the moral character of Jesus, and are willing to admit that by his life and death he has proved a benefactor to our race; and by thus winning us over from sin to virtue, he may be well considered our

Redeemer. But, as to the blood of the cross poured out as an expiation for sin, to propitiate the Deity, and to reconcile him to man, they ridicule it as a grand impertinence. Properly stated and duly guarded, the moral-subjective aspect of the atonement does not—as Abelard, Socinus, Jowett, and other rationalists contend—exclude the propitiatory and governmental aspects; but it derives from them all its force as a vital element of the atonement. Without the other it is dead, being alone; and we should not much err if we were to say that those who restrict the atonement to the moral-subjective aspect do not merely hold erroneous views concerning the atonement, but virtually deny this great essential doctrine of Christianity.

In other connections will be found a statement of what is true

and a refutation of what is false, in this moral-subjective theory of the atonement.

§ 7. The Bernardine, or Mystical-subjective Theory.

Bernard of Clairvaux rejected the theory of Abelard. Being of a more earnest nature, he set forth the mystical-subjective idea of the atonement. "He insisted," says Hagenbach, "on the mystical idea of the vicarious death of Christ." Christ, the head, and his people, the body, are one, and so when he died they died with him, explaining 2 Cor. v. 14, like the Broad-churchmen, in that sense.

Aquinas so far embraced this view as to maintain that the death of Christ was an atonement only as the believer is "configurated" to Christ. This is susceptible of an orthodox interpretation; but as developed by the angelical doctor and his Romish followers, it means to be "configured" to Christ by personal suffering in the form of penance, as well as by the acceptance of the sufferings of the Redeemer. This was crystallized in the Tridentine theology—it is the tap-root of Romanism—and against it is leveled our Twentieth Article: "Of the one oblation of Christ, finished upon the cross." It assumed a deeper mystical type in the writings of the mystics of the fourteenth century.

Thus John Ruusbroec (born near Brussels in 1293) resolved the atonement into the incarnation: as God thus made himself man, we may assimilate ourselves to the divine nature by the imitation of

God—the central idea in mystic theology.

Henry Seuss, a Dominican of Cologne, and a member of the society of "The Friends of God," was more ardent than Ruusbroec; he made the passion of Christ the center of his system. We must imitate Christ in his passion, and so be reconciled to God. This imitation of Christ means self-reconciliation.

Thus there were two aspects of mediaeval mysticism in regard to the atonement:

1. Some held that self-renunciation is perfect when the soul attains to a state of calm contemplation, and when the reason is purified from all sensible and other hinderances. This may be called the rationalist mysticism. In its theory of an *Imitatio Christi*, Christ is the ideal *man*, who can be imitated because he is man, and its central doctrine is the dogma of the incarnation.

2. Some held that self-renunciation is perfect when the soul attains to a state of enthusiastic vision, and when it has triumphed over the body, which has been

reduced to a nullity by emaciation and maceration. This may be called the enthusiastic mysticism. In its theory of an *Imitatio Christi*, Christ is the ideal Sufferer, who can be imitated because he brought his body into subjection, and the central doctrine is the dogma of the Passion.[3]

It is needless to show how these mystic views of the atonement were reproduced by the Quietists and others of the Romish Church, and by fanatical sects among Protestants. Indeed, this mysticism contains so many elements of truth, and elements which resemble truth, that the Wesleys at one time were in danger of being fascinated thereby.[4]

It is remarkable that this mystical-subjective theory of the atonement should have so conspicuous a place in the system of the Broad-church section of the Church of England and their imitators among the Non-conformists.

The principal asserters of these mystical notions were Professor Maurice and Fred. W. Robertson. The sermons of the latter have done much to give them currency: see especially his beautiful, but insnaring, sermon on 2 Cor. v. 14, which he interprets like Bernard and others of that school: "If one died for all, then all died in him"—which, as we have shown, is a false rendering, and runs counter to the scope of the apostle's argument.

Mr. Robertson and his friends allow "that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, but only a sacrifice of self-will, which is the root of all evil. His endurance of punishment was his perfect willingness that the loving God's wrath against the unlovely should continue to work among men until all unloveliness disappears; and that he, becoming one of them, should not be specially exempt. Hence sacrifice in Christ and sacrifice in man is one and the same thing—viz., the abandonment of self-will, the adoption of the divine. The idea of his expiating guilt by making himself a true and proper sacrifice of atonement is denunciated; and, in fact, neither the obedience which he renders nor the cross which he bears is, in any sense whatever, the procuring cause of man's redemption."[5]

The neo-Platonism of Mr. Robertson is thus described:

> Christ was the eternal idea or type of humanity, "the reality of human nature." He was the representative man. Whatever he did during his incarnation was done by us in him. In this sense he stood in the place of us all; and recognizing the law of sacrifice as the great law of being, by his absolute submission to the will of the Father—a submission which, because it was perfect, involved the necessity of suffering to death—he grappled with and vanquished the evil which tyrannized over our nature, and made us virtually partakers of his triumph. He was our sacrifice, not because he died on the cross, but because his entire self-surrender as the realized idea of our humanity, the idea of man created, represents the sacrifice of us all in the like submission of ourselves to God. Not his death, not his blood-shedding, was the sacrifice for sin. It was his entire devoting of himself to the Father's will. God was satisfied with the offering of Christ because "for the first time he saw human nature a copy of the divine nature, the will of man the Son perfectly coincident with the will of God the Father." And this work of Christ was the work of humanity. In Christ thus made perfect, God "saw humanity submitted to the law of self-sacrifice," and "in the light of that idea he beholds us as perfect, and is satisfied."[6]

We cannot comprehend how these men could put forth sentiments like these, in the very teeth of the articles and liturgy which they had sworn to maintain, and the latter of which constantly to repeat, and which unequivocally assert that "Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men"—that God gave his "only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who

made there (by his oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect,

and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

That the articles and liturgy correspond precisely with the Holy Scriptures cannot be successfully gainsaid; and that these teach that the atonement was objective and propitiatory, as well as subjective (moral and mystical), is plain to all. These men should either renounce their heresies or else secede from the Church, and, according as they incline to the moral or to the mystical view of the atonement—or, to speak with greater precision, rejection of the atonement—go over to Racovia or to Rome, or form themselves into a new communion, like the Swedenborgians (to whom, by the way, they bear some resemblance) and others, who dissent from the orthodox standards, the faith once delivered unto the saints, and who "deny the Lord that bought them."

"But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness." (1 Cor. i. 23.) "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Gal. vi. 14.)

We hold to all that is scriptural in the subjective view of the atonement (both moral and mystical), as also in the governmental; but unless these be blended with the propitiatory view of the Saviour's sacrifice, there is no anchor-ground for our hope, which can fasten its flukes nowhere but in "the wounds of Jesus."

Guilty I stand before thy face.
On me I feel thy wrath abide;
'Tis just the sentence should take place,
'Tis just—but O, thy Son hath died!

Jesus, the Lamb of God, hath bled;
He bore our sins upon the tree;
Beneath our curse he bowed his head:
'Tis finished! he hath died for me!

---

1. See Watson's "Institutes," II. 20, pp. 436, 437.↩
2. Hagenbach, "History of Christian Doctrine" (Sec. 268); "Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine," II. 279, 280; "McClintock & Strong's Biblical Cyclopedia," Articles *Anselm, Atonement.*↩

3. British Quarterly Review, Oct., 1874.↩
4. Charles Wesley alludes to it in that fine hymn (1008), based on Rom. x. 6–10:

> Oft I in my heart have said,
> "Who shall ascend on high,
> Mount to Christ, my glorious Head,
> And bring him from the sky?
> Borne on contemplation's wing.
> Surely I shall find him there,
> Where the angels praise their King,
> And gain the Morning Star."
>
> Oft I in my heart have said,
> "Who to the deep shall stoop,
> Sink with Christ among the dead,
> From thence to bring him up?
> Could I but my heart prepare.
> By unfeigned humility,
> Christ would quickly enter there,
> And ever dwell in me."
>
> But the righteousness of faith
> Hath taught me better things;
> "Inward turn thine eyes," it saith,
> While Christ to me it brings.
> "Christ is ready to impart
> Life to all for life who sigh:
> In thy mouth and in thy heart
> The word is ever nigh."↩

5. Candlish on Maurice's "Theological Essays;" Field's "Handbook of Christian Theology," pp. 132, 133.↩
6. *London Review*, XXXIII. (Wesleyan).↩

Chapter VI. A Final Statement of the Doctrine of Atonement.

§ 1. Importance of the Doctrine.

256

[Historically and doctrinally the atonement is fundamental. Historically, the atonement is the outward, objective fact in the work of Christ—the events of whose life, including his incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and session, make up the continuous fabric of his mediatorial existence, and constitute the historical foundation of his religion—which makes Christ Jesus a Helper, and his salvation a help, different in essence and power, from all others that have been offered to mankind. Doctrinally, the atonement is that central truth in Christian theology which gives distinctive character to Christianity as a system of ethical and religious thought. Historically, it is that event in the external order of the actual life of the world which has organized Christianity as the most powerful engine in modern civilization, and as the exclusive religion for the regeneration of mankind. Doctrinally, it is that dogma in the scientific and intellectual elaboration of the theological teachings of the New Testament by virtue of which Christianity, as revealed and absolute truth, the unique religion, must be intolerant of all external systems, and, in the sphere of apologetics, refuse to co-ordinate with itself any ethnic religion or any set of philosophical doctrines.

Not only does the doctrine of the one atonement in Christ build the wall against all enemies that attack from without: it is the living organizer of all the inward elements of the truth. The doctrine of atonement stands in a relation that is adequately described only as vital and organic to the leading elements of a completed Christian theology. According to the beginning point, it molds, or is molded by, the other doctrines. As is our doctrine of atonement, so will be our conception of the character of God, of the dignity and worth of humanity, of the heinousness and demerit of sin, of the person and work of the Son of

257

God, of the office of the Holy Ghost, and of the value of the glad tidings which the Church is commissioned to herald to the nations. A degraded theory of atonement drags all the other principles of the Christian system to its own low level. A false or incomplete soteriology works radical and wide-spread mischief. It begets a shallow theology—a fragmentary and partial outlook upon the divine nature; a vicious anthropology—a hasty and superficial diagnosis of the ethical constitution and history of the human race; an unworthy hamartiology—a representation of sin as a light matter, a mere disturbance of external order, to be met by a governmental expedient; an unbiblical Christology, in which Christ may be only the mightiest of many mighty teachers, reformers, and saviours; an impertinent pneumatology, in which there remains little or no place for the gracious leadings and cleansing of the Spirit; and an enervating ecclesiology, in which the Church is stripped of her glory and sinks into the category of the other social and moral agencies which are at work among men. In reverse order, one may begin with inadequate doctrines concerning God, Man, and Sin, and he will as surely reach an inadequate doctrine of Salvation, for Salvation is designed to harmonize God and Man by the destruction of Sin. Salvation is the mediatorial doctrine, as Christ, the Prince of Salvation, is the mediatorial person. In either case, to purify and enlarge the one doctrine of atonement, until the polemic theologian shall bring it to occupy and altogether fill the great place assigned it in the New Testament, is to correct and amplify any system into which it enters, and conform all the components of that system to the Biblical standard.

Especially is the right appreciation of atonement necessary to the normal growth of Protestantism. It is the correlate of justification by faith. Rome may have the sacrament of penance, the repeated sacrifices upon the altar, and the Church's deposit of the supererogatory works of the saints of all ages, by which to cover sin. Protestantism—blessed truth!—has only the blood of Christ, and in his name only pronounces blessing upon the head of that man whose sin is covered.

Both the defenders and the enemies of the faith instinctively recognize that in the atonement is to be discovered the one sufficient reason for the being of Christianity. The peculiar end of the Church, separated from community with the ends of any

other society whatsoever, at once the warrant of its organic existence and the guarantee of its continued life, until the accomplishment of the commission received from the Church's Head, is the proclamation of the finished redemption in Christ. The Church is a mission, celestial in origin and equipment, in the midst of a population foreign and estranged. To this Church is given the ministry of reconciliation, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; to her ministers is committed the word of reconciliation that, as embassadors for Christ, they may beseech sinners to be reconciled to God. Announcing that God is reconciled to *man*, on the basis of this reconciliation the Church prays *men* to be reconciled to God. Hence arises the desire on the part of rationalists and Broad-churchmen to explain away the atonement, and on the part of those whose faith has received the supernatural religion, with all of its historical and doctrinal contents, to establish the foundations here once for all.

To this instinctive sense of the situation are to be traced also the continued production of treatises and multiplication of theories, which are frequently not professional and theological, but partake of a semi-literary character. Horace Bushnell and a whole school of English and American writers have written for a public wider than the theological, or even the distinctively religious, and have found readers beyond the walls of theological seminaries and the ranks of the clergy. Men hesitate to recognize that element in the eternal and immutable constitution of the divine nature which demands purity and holiness, and pronounces desert of punishment upon sin. Therefore they ask, Is there any thing in God to fear? and we have a revival of superficial theories, not only of the Socinian, Grotian, and governmental types, but also of a moral and purely sentimental character. From all these heresies, and tendencies to heresy, the Church of to-day must jealously preserve herself.]

§ 2. Definition of Atonement.

The atonement is the satisfaction made to God for the sins of all mankind, original and actual, by the mediation of Christ, and especially by his passion and death, so that pardon might be granted to all, while the divine perfections are kept in harmony, the authority of the Sovereign is upheld, and the strongest

motives are brought to bear upon sinners to lead them to repentance, to faith in Christ, the necessary conditions of pardon, and to a life of obedience, by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit.

Watson, in his "Biblical and Theological Dictionary" gives a more concise definition: "The satisfaction offered to divine justice by the death of Christ for the sins of mankind, by virtue of which all true penitents who believe in Christ are personally reconciled to God, are freed from the penalty of their sins, and entitled to eternal life."

Our definition is more specific in that it states explicitly that the satisfaction is universal in its extent, that it involves the mediation of Christ, and has a threefold bearing and effect. All this, indeed, is virtually implied in Watson's definition.

[The latest, and, so far as the writer knows, the only, distinct treatise on atonement that Methodism has produced is the work of Dr. John Miley, Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. Dr. Miley early in his monograph gives us a formal definition of atonement. It is as follows:

> The vicarious sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin as a conditional substitute for penalty, fulfilling, on the forgiveness of sin, the obligation of justice and the office of penalty in moral government.[1]

An analytical comparison of Dr. Summers's and Dr. Miley's definitions reveals several points of difference.

1. Dr. Summers calls atonement a satisfaction made to God, which form of expression Dr. Miley not only excludes from his definition, but carefully avoids and stringently opposes throughout his treatise, since he identifies the satisfaction theory with the Calvinistic scheme of commercial substitution, always calling this last-mentioned doctrine the doctrine of satisfaction.

2. Dr. Summers gives the atonement relation to original as well as to actual sin, as is done by our second Article of Religion —"whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for the original guilt, but also for actual sins of men," and also by the twentieth, "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." This Dr. Miley's definition ignores, and his whole

essay does not touch the question except when he glances at the relation of the atonement to infant salvation;[2] and in this momentary consideration it would appear that he attaches little weight to the teachings of the fifth chapter of Romans, since he makes no reference to it: a brief statement of exegetical results, if nothing more, would have been very pertinent.

3. Dr. Summers makes the atonement consist of the entire mediation of Christ, *especially* of his passion and death, while Dr. Miley speaks only of the vicarious sufferings, though he is doubtless in complete accord with Dr. Summers, as is evinced by his masterly treatment of the great passage in the second chapter of Philippians: "The incarnation itself is a great fact of atoning value in the redemptive mediation of Christ. . . . There are two marvelous facts: the self-emptying—ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε—or self-divestment of a rightful glory in equality with God; and an assumption, instead, of the form of a servant in the likeness of men."[3] Nevertheless, we are not to overlook the superiority of Dr. Summers's definition in point of comprehensiveness.

4. Dr. Summers assigns three results to the atonement, or grounds it in three necessities, though it is but right to state that the last of these he did not class in respect to urgency with the other two great necessities. In this last particular he and Dr. Miley are again in agreement.[4] The three results or necessities are: (1) The holding in harmony of the divine perfections: this follows from the previous doctrine that the atonement is a satisfaction made to God; (2) the upholding of the authority of the Sovereign; (3) the bringing to bear of the strongest motives upon sinners to repent and believe. Here Dr. Summers has most felicitously combined all the elements of truth in the three great theories of atonement—Satisfaction, Governmental, and Moral. Dr. Miley represents the atonement only as a conditional substitute for penalty, fulfilling the obligation of justice and the office of penalty in moral government. His atonement yields only a governmental result, and has its only ground in a governmental necessity. He himself has chosen the title and uniformly calls his theory Rectoral, or Governmental.

5. Finally, Dr. Summers's definition includes the securing of a life of obedience by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit. He

thus effectually guards the doctrine of atonement and its correlate

justification by faith from Antinomian accusation and abuse. He answers those objections that have been in the mouth of opponents from the time of Paul, the original expounder of these truths, until the present. Here doubtless our two Doctors are also in harmony; but mark the grasp and reach of Dr. Summers's formula. There may be other minor points of difference between these two definitions. It is not necessary for our purpose to be exhaustive; the differences enumerated lie out broadly on the face of the two formulas.[5]]

§ 3. Ground of Atonement.

According to our definition, the ground or occasion of the atonement is "the sins of all mankind, original and actual." This agrees with this second article, which states that the Son of God was made man and suffered, "to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men." So the twentieth article: "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."

Original sin does not here mean the one single act of transgression on the part of our first parents in the eating of the forbidden fruit, nor any similar act of transgression "in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually"—as is set forth in our seventh article. This perfectly agrees with Paul in Rom. v. 18, 19: "As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 22.)

Mankind constitute a species; all are "made of one blood;"

they are viewed as a solidarity; all were seminally contained in the primal pair. When our first parents fell, the species fell. If the

penalty of the law had been then enforced the species would have been cut off. To prevent this disastrous result the atonement was provided. This secured the perpetuation of the species. But it did not so take effect that Adam's posterity are not born in sin. They all partake of his fallen nature. The depravity of mankind is inherited, inherent, universal. But as it would be unjust and cruel to bring multiplied millions of responsible and immortal beings into existence, in this miserable condition, without furnishing them a remedy, the atonement was so devised as to meet all the demands of the case. There is no inherited and inherent depravity in man for which atonement has not been made by Christ. But with the nature they possess and the influences brought to bear upon them, actual, personal transgression will certainly be committed by them, and this liability to sin will remain as long as they remain in their probationary state. Hence, it were better for them that they never had been born—that every one had died seminally, as he sinned seminally, in Adam—than that they should be brought into the world with this liability to actual sin, if no provision were made to reach this case; therefore the atonement is made "not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men." Thus John the Baptist says: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." (John i. 29.) And John the apostle: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 1, 2.) And the great Atoner himself says: "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." (Mark iii. 28, 29.) That is, all may be saved by accepting the atonement, while all shall be damned who reject it—who wantonly and persistently "neglect the great salvation."

Sin is the curse and calamity of the universe. "The wages of sin is death." There is the penalty. How can it be averted? Justice might have inflicted it on the primal sinning pair; but mercy sues for pardon.

263

Our misery doth for pity call,

Our sin implores thy grace.

But how can God be just, and the justifier of sinners? How, in view of his own perfections, the interests of the universe, and the future fealty of the transgressors, can they be pardoned? Milton's theology is sometimes at fault, but he speaks to the point on this subject. He represents "the great Creator" as thus addressing the Son:

Man disobeying,
Disloyal, breaks his fealty, and sins
Against the high supremacy of Heaven,
Affecting Godhead, and, so losing all,
To expiate his treason hath naught left,
But to destruction sacred and devote,
He, with his whole posterity, must die.
Die he or justice must; unless for him
Some other able, and as willing, pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death.

By a bold stroke of poetic imagination he represents God as asking the "heavenly powers" which of them will undertake the task, but all "stood mute:"

And now without redemption all mankind
Must have been lost, adjudged to death and hell,
By doom severe, had not the Son of God,
In whom the fullness dwells of love divine,
His dearest mediation thus renewed.
Father, thy word is past, man shall find grace.
Once dead in sins, and lost,
Atonement for himself, or offering meet.
Indebted, and undone, hath none to bring;
Behold me, then: me for him, life for life,
I offer.

The poet, by another bold stroke, represents the Son as pleading with the Father to spare the sinning race, though, like the rebel angels, "they themselves ordained their fall."

For should man finally be lost, should man,
Thy creature late so loved, thy youngest son,
Fall circumvented thus by fraud, though joined
With his own folly? That be from thee far.

Or shall the Adversary thus obtain
His end and frustrate thine?
Or wilt thou thyself
Abolish thy creation, and unmake
For him what for thy glory thou hast made?

264

So should thy goodness and thy greatness both
Be questioned and blasphemed without defense.

Milton solves the problem with which the schoolmen and others also have been perplexed—Why fallen angels should be left without redemption, and fallen men be redeemed, whereas both were equally free in their revolt:

The first sort by their own suggestion fell,
Self-tempted, self-depraved: Man falls, deceived
By the other first: Man therefore shall find grace.
The other none.

As there was no temptation to occasion the fall of angels, so there is no solidarity, no hereditary depravity, in their case. The sin of every one of "the angels which kept not their first estate," but "left their own habitation," was in every sense original, independent, untransmissible, and, as it would seem, inexpiable. Hence "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell." (2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.)

It has not pleased God, in the angelology of revelation, to inform us what measures were pursued to keep them from transgression, or what means were adopted, if any, to bring them to repentance, and restore them to their forfeited inheritance of purity and bliss. It is very certain that the dream of Origen finds no countenance in Scripture, that the fallen angels are interested in the atonement made for "sinners of a mortal race."

It may be true, as the schoolmen thought, and as we may more fully notice in the sequel, that the angels who were "faithful among the faithless" have their virtue confirmed and their happiness assured by the atonement made for man. But in no proper sense can it be said that the mediation of Christ was undertaken for any other than Adam and his descendants. They needed it, and they profit by it; and hence,

God was made man, for man to die.

There is not the slightest countenance in Scripture to the fond conceit that the Eternal *Logos* would have become incarnate, and lived and died on earth, if man had not sinned. His errand to our earth was one of salvation, and if man had not sinned he would not have needed salvation, and no Saviour would have been provided. If man had not fallen, the mediation of Christ would have been a grand impertinence; nay, an absolute impossibility. If God becomes incarnate—if in his assumed nature he

lived, suffered, and died—nothing less than the redemption of a world of sinners lost can justify the amazing interposition. “But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself”—“Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.” (Heb. ix. 26, 28.)

This then is the ground or occasion of the atonement: “to save a world of sinners lost.”

Father, thine everlasting love
Thy only Son for sinners gave.
Whose grace to all did freely move,
And sent him down the world to save.
Help us thy mercy to extol,
Immense, unfathomed, unconfined;
To praise the Lamb who died for all,
The general Saviour of mankind.
Thy undistinguishing regard
Was cast on Adam’s fallen race;
For all thou hast in Christ prepared
Sufficient, sovereign, saving grace.
The world he suffered to redeem;
For all he hath th’ atonement made:
For those that will not come to him
The ransom of his life was paid.

§ 4. The Three Aspects of Atonement.

The essential nature of the atonement is this: It is a satisfaction or propitiation for the sius of all mankind. It has necessarily three aspects. The first regards the nature and claims of the Divine

Majesty: herein is its primary propitiatory virtue. The second regards the well-being of the universe: herein we see its governmental importance. The third regards the interests of God's rebellious subjects thus favored: herein we discover its moral bearings.

§ 5. Propitiatory Aspect of Atonement.

Its true satisfactory and expiatory character is seen primarily and especially in regard to the nature and claims of the Divine Majesty.

God's nature is perfectly holy. He cannot tolerate sin. He can have no fellowship with sinners. There can be no communion between light and darkness. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." If he creates moral beings he must govern them; he must exact obedience from them. He must maintain

the reign of law; and that implies the prescription of the precept and the enforcement of the penalty. We say it with reverence—this is not a matter of choice with the universal Sovereign. He must maintain and display the holiness of his nature; he must rule the world in righteousness. He has promised reward for obedience; he has threatened punishment for disobedience. He must be

> Faithful in his promises,
> And in his threatenings too.

Indeed, every perfection of his nature demands that he shall enforce the sanctions of his law; consequently, no attribute of the Deity will allow God to pardon sin without due satisfaction. His wisdom must be vindicated in creating moral beings, and putting them under law. His power must be vindicated in the enforcement of the penalty, as impunity would argue weakness on the part of the Sovereign, and induce contempt on the part of the subject. His truth, comprehending both veracity and faithfulness, must be vindicated, as it requires the execution of the threat, and would be outraged were it set aside in the exercise of an unconditional prerogative of pardoning mercy. His justice must be vindicated. The integrity of his nature will not allow him to swerve a hair's breadth from the strictest equity. It would not be vindicated, but rather outraged, if

he were not to render to the sinner the just desert of his sin, unless an equivalent for his punishment be paid, that pardon might be granted; and so God might be just while he justifies—that is, absolves the sinner. His goodness must be vindicated. It revolts from sin, while it would befriend the sinner. Sin is the curse and calamity of the universe. It is only evil continually. In its own nature, as well as from the positive infliction of divine vengeance, it results in the ruin of the sinner. It makes him a moral wreck, helpless and hopeless. It requires no argument to show that goodness can allow nothing to be done which in the slightest degree connives at sin.

O Sovereign Love, to thee I cry!
Give me thyself or else I die!
Save me from death, from hell set free!
Death, hell, are but the want of thee!

How then can infinite goodness sanction the remission of the punishment due to sin? That would not be benevolence, nor kindness, nor mercy, but cruelty. Benevolence is as much concerned

as justice and truth in the maintenance of law and order in the universe, and would be as much outraged as those other perfections if pardon were granted without expiation. Thus there must be a demonstration of the infinite perfections of Jehovah. They must not be infringed, they must not be set at jar, but maintained in perfect harmony.

Were there but two parties in the universe, God and the sinner —an individual sinner—there could be no reconciliation between them, they could not be brought into loving fellowship, without the intervention of such an expedient as would satisfy the demands of infinite wisdom, power, truth, justice, and goodness; so that after pardon should be extended to the sinner—yea, in the very act of granting it, and because of such pardon—the Divine Majesty should shine forth, full-orbed in his whole round of rays complete.

It is not proper to say that the divine benevolence was ready to forgive sin without a propitiation, but the divine justice interposed a barrier. This seems to be implied in Milton's "Paradise Lost," III. 403–412:

No sooner did thy dear and only Son
Perceive thee purposed not to doom frail man

So strictly, but much more to pity inclined,
He, to appease thy wrath, and end the strife
Of mercy and justice in thy face discerned,
Regardless of the bliss wherein he sat
Second to thee, offered himself to die
For man's offense. O unexampled love,
Love nowhere to be found less than divine!
Hail, Son of God, Saviour of men!

There was doubtless "wrath" in God to be "appeased," hence Christ is the propitiation for our sins. But there was no "strife of mercy and justice" to be *ended* by the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Mercy demanded satisfaction as much as justice. Mercy would not allow sin to be pardoned without atonement any more than justice; and justice is as ready as mercy to pardon the penitent sinner on the basis of that atonement.

When divines speak of harmonizing the attributes of God by the atonement of Christ, the language must not be so understood as if they were ever at "strife." So when the language of the Psalmist, which refers to a different subject (Ps. lxxxv. 10): "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace

have kissed each other," is applied to the atonement of Christ, it must not be inferred that these attributes were ever in a hostile relation, and so needed reconciliation. The reconciliation effected by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ is the reconciliation of his Father to us (as the second article teaches), and our consequent reconciliation to him.

To the sinner, indeed, for obvious reasons, mercy appears to be God's "darling attribute," and his "favorite name" is Love.

Mercy is thy distinguished name,
And suits the sinner best.

Yet from the divine stand-point there is no difference; there is a perfect harmony of the attributes of God, both when he punishes and when he pardons. The sterner and the softer perfections are intimately and inseparably blended; and especially in his "strange design" to save sinners:

Here the whole Deity is known,
Nor dares a creature guess

Which of the glories brighter shone,
The justice or the grace.

We do not, therefore, speak of the atonement as simply satisfying divine justice and displaying divine goodness. It displays and satisfies every attribute of the Godhead.

[At this point, especially as it will afford occasion for a yet fuller exhibition of the truly sacrificial character of Christ's death, it may be well to notice the insufficiency of all merely governmental or rectoral theories of atonement. Of these Dr. Miley's is one of the ablest, and we shall allow him to speak as the representative of all.

But let us be careful that Dr. Miley's doctrine is not mistaken or misrepresented. It may be that he has not been able to include explanation, enlargement, and exposition within the limits of the definition already cited. Is it entirely certain that he does not ground the necessity for atonement in the essential nature and immutable character of God apart from his rectoral office and relation? It is granted that there are some passages in his book that on first reading, and considered apart from the underlying and pervading principle of his doctrine, seem to admit such a necessity. But a more attentive examination will often reveal limitations and saving clauses in the passages themselves; and, further, they are rebutted by explicit assertions to the contrary.

269

An extended consideration of Dr. Miley's teaching, as will be shown by large quotation, will make it appear that he does not allow a separate and distinct demand for atonement in the divine nature apart from God's office as a Sovereign. He earnestly contends that if such a demand be allowed it must yield an atonement by commercial substitution, or, as he calls it, satisfaction. So far as a demand for atonement in the nature of God may be regarded as acknowledged by Dr. Miley, he identifies it with, and absorbs it in, the demand that lies in the necessities of government. His section in which he vindicates the necessity for atonement is entitled "Necessity in Moral Government."[6] "The necessity for the redemptive mediation of Christ lies ultimately in the perfections of God," he says, and we think here is the great truth unequivocally stated, but he immediately adds the saving phrase, "as moral Ruler."[7] In the same connection he continues:

We have the truth of a divine moral government as the ground-fact in

the necessity for an atonement. We have found the facts and principles of such a government strongly affirmative of this necessity. They thus respond to the explicit affirmations of Scripture thereon. Further, we have found this necessity to be grounded in the profoundest interests of moral government, for the protection of which the penalties of the divine justice have a necessary function. Here we have the real hinderance to a mere administrative forgiveness, and, therefore, the real necessity for an atonement. The true office of atonement follows accordingly.[8]

The penalties of divine justice are, therefore, not the manifestation of God's essential rectitude and holiness abstracted from all governmental considerations, nor is there any bar in the divine nature to sovereign forgiveness—this bar is wholly the demand of governmental exigencies. It is not desired to attach any inference to Dr. Miley's doctrine that he does not avow, and he shall be freely, but briefly, quoted by passages taken from every part of his book:

In the governmental theory, the scientifically consistent necessity arises in the interest of moral government, and as an imperative requirement of some provision which may fulfill the rectoral office of penalty in the case of forgiveness.[9] . . . We ground the necessity in the fact and requirements of moral government.[10] . . . And God, as a righteous Ruler, must inflict merited penalty upon sin, not, indeed, in the gratification of any mere personal resentment, nor in the satisfaction of an absolute retributive justice, but in the interest of moral government, or find some rectorally compensatory measure for the remission of penalty.[11] . . . While divine penalty falls only upon sin, the supreme reason

for its infliction is in the rectoral ends with which moral government is concerned. Nor is the penal infliction a moral necessity apart from these ends.[12] . . . There is no sufficient reason why sin must be punished solely on the ground of its demerit. . . . And all other ends apart [the ends of moral government apart from the demands of God's essential nature], retributive justice may remit its penalty. *It may do this without an atonement.*[13] . . . And with no absolute necessity for the punishment of sin, it seems clear that but for the requirements of rectoral justice, compassion would triumph over the disposition of a purely retributive justice.[14] . . . But as penalties are remissible so far as a purely retributive justice is concerned; so, having a special end in the interests of moral government, they may give place to any substitutional measure equally securing that end.[15] The demerit of sin imposes no obligation of punishment upon the Divine Ruler.[16] The rectoral ends of moral government are a profounder imperative with justice itself than the retribution of sin, simply as such.[17] The cross is the highest revelation of all the truths which embody the best

moral forces of the divine government.[18]

We challenge that both in the New Testament and in Christian experience the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ is infinitely more than the embodiment of the forces of moral government!

And real as the divine displeasure is against sin and against sinners, atonement is made, not in its personal satisfaction, but in fulfillment of the rectoral office of justice.[19]

It would be well if Dr. Miley could definitely tell us what is his conception of displeasure against sin and sinners in such a being as the unchanging and holy God. Is it appeased without a consideration? Is it a mere temporary affection, an ebullition of personal feeling, that, after the analogy of human wrath, will burn itself out and gradually die away if let alone?

Yet the atoning sacrifice of Christ neither appeases the personal displeasure of God nor conciliates his personal friendship.[20] Could a sinner, without the helping grace of redemption, sincerely repent and render a true obedience, there would he a coincidence upon him of the divine regards of personal friendship and judicial condemnation.[21]

Such a conclusion, the legitimate outcome of Dr. Miley's theory, which he has had the frankness to explicitly state, stamps that theory as untrue. The idea here expressed is utterly unbiblical. Dr. Miley cannot produce a single proof-text from the New Testament containing an approximation to the thought contained in this strange sentence of his. We know that God loved

us before the atonement, and that his love provided the atonement —this truth will receive full treatment before the discussion closes; but God's love producing an atonement for the satisfaction of his holiness that he may forgive the sinner is widely different from a coincidence of the divine regards of personal friendship and judicial condemnation upon a person for whom no atonement has been made. You may be the possessor of the personal friendship of God, and yet under sentence of judicial condemnation! Almighty God is your friend—your personal friend—and yet you are in danger—in danger of eternal death! This omnipotent personal friend, in whose favor you abide, is powerless to help you! God has constructed a government that ties his own hands and nullifies his own personal friendship! He cannot bless and save a sinner whose attitude and state he personally accepts! God's law is holier than God's nature!

The immaculate God, who is a consuming fire to all sin, can endure and accept that which his law condemns and punishes! One more quotation will be sufficient.

> But for his regard for these rights and interests [of moral government], and, therefore, for the sacredness and authority of his law as the necessary means of their protection, *he might have satisfied the yearnings of his compassion toward us in a mere administrative forgiveness.*[22]

It is very clear that Dr. Miley means to leave us no reason for mistaking his doctrine. If he has passages that speak of God's personal displeasure against sin, he is careful to explicitly inform us that the atonement is not grounded in any necessity for the propitiation of this displeasure. So pointedly does he put this, and so completely does he absorb the personal wrath of God, and the primitive desert of sin, in the ends of moral government, that he tells us that, apart from moral government, mercy and compassion may so dominate justice and holiness in the essential nature of God, without any sort of consideration or satisfaction offered to the offended Deity, that he might forgive sin, so far as it is an offense to his own purity and personal righteousness, by mere sovereign prerogative, while the only obstacles are interposed by moral government, considered in itself, and these insuperably prevent administrative pardon. Hence the necessity for atonement is grounded in moral government alone.

The question now arises, Is Dr. Miley's the Methodist doctrine of atonement? Can we regard it as fortunate that the only express Methodist treatise on atonement should ground its theory exclusively in a governmental necessity? Does Dr. Miley's theory adequately interpret Scripture in those profound texts which represent the demand for propitiation and reconciliation as arising among the divine attributes in the innermost recesses of the divine nature? Or is Dr. Summers nearer the truth of Scripture, and nearer the Methodist doctrine as taught by Watson, the first, and Pope, the last, of great Methodist writers on systematic theology? Can the atonement be represented as a satisfaction to God, a harmonization of the divine nature and attributes, and a reconciliation of God to the world, without the errors of the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution? Can we hold fast the profoundest teachings of the New Testament without abating one jot or tittle of all the meaning that an undogmatic and scholary exegete will find

in them, and yet reject the Calvinistic soteriology? Watson, Pope, and Summers seem to think those Scriptures teach that atonement is a real satisfaction to the demands of the divine nature, and that this is consistent with the true Arminian doctrine of atonement, Dr. Miley to the contrary notwithstanding.

It may be freely admitted that advance in scientific theological statement, as in every other department of human thought and activity, must come through the work of the specialist. The monographic treatment of the minute student of a single section of Christian doctrine ought to differ widely, in method, and possibly in results, from the work of the general writer on systematic theology. We expect his work to abound in criticisms, and, if the whole truth and the exact truth has not before been reached, he is the man to define, elucidate, establish, and defend it. Certainly Dr. Miley is privileged to work up the doctrine of the Atonement, as Dr. Pope has presented the doctrine of the Person of Christ, Dr. Whedon the doctrine of the Will, and Dr. Summers the doctrine of Baptism. Certainly he may show, if possible, that Watson and Pope and Summers are wrong, and that if Whedon and Raymond had been making a specialty of atonement their acknowledged principles would have developed into a scientific treatment practically one with the doctrine Dr. Miley has set forth. All this may be fairly granted. But the

question is, Has he succeeded in accomplishing such a work as this?

Dr. Miley has continually written upon the assumption that there is no middle place between the rectoral theory and the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution, which secures the unconditional discharge of all for whose sins Christ's death paid the penalty, and carries with it all the Calvinistic peculiarities of limited atonement, unconditional election, irresistible grace, and final perseverance. This he has misnamed the satisfaction theory. Watson, Pope, and Summers are certainly satisfactionists; but this is not their theory. Miley denies that there is any scientific place for them. They must either be Calvinists or give in their adhesion to the pure rectoral theory. But it is strange that all these Methodist theologians, some of whom were certainly possessed of as much exegetical skill, metaphysical acumen, and logical power as Dr. Miley has manifested in any part of his treatise, should have all lodged in an unscientific and indefensible half-way position, unable

to see that if they abandoned the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution their principles must carry them over to the governmental theory of atonement. Dr. Miley is free to essay the rescue of Methodism and of these uncritical theologians from an inconsistent doctrine; but, undoubtedly, the whole ground must be very carefully reviewed before he can be permitted to hold the field unchallenged. He must make good his position.

It is an acknowledged principle laid down by Dr. Miley, in common with others, that any theory of atonement, to be valid, must adequately interpret the Scripture. Systematic theology, like systematic science, is the formulating of general propositions and laws which must fully embrace and explain all the individual phenomena grouped under them. The fatal defect of the rectoral theory, however it may approve itself to a shallow rationalism, is that it is not an interpretation of Scripture in its profound representations of propitiation and reconciliation. The issue with Dr. Miley is made at once just here. The writer is not desirous of setting forth his own naked and unsupported opinions and interpretations; when he can add to the native worth of the argument, he advances the authority of those whose theological learning is unquestioned, and who have earned the right to be heard. Dr. Pope is one of the most accomplished of

the many learned Greek exegetes of Great Britain, which perhaps leads Germany in the single department of New Testament criticism and interpretation. The pre-eminent merit of his great work on systematic theology is its approximation to Biblical theology in its close adherence to exegetical methods. Here we have few of those long chains of abstract reasoning that fill so many other bodies of divinity, in which there are no quotations from Scripture, and little attempt to rest the pillars of the argument upon supporting Biblical deliverances. Dr. Pope has set forth the true doctrine so lucidly and succinctly that the argument conducted by frequent quotation from him must be largely the gainer thereby. His general preparatory statement is made in this language:

The teaching of Scripture on this subject may be summed as follows: The Finished Work, as accomplished by the Mediator himself, in his relation to mankind, is his divine-human obedience regarded as an expiatory sacrifice—the Atonement proper. Then it may be studied in its results as to God, as to God and man, and as to man. First, it is the supreme

manifestation of the glory and consistency of the divine attributes; and, as to this, is termed the Righteousness of God. Secondly, as it respects God and man, it is the Reconciliation, a word which involves two truths, or rather one truth under two aspects: the propitiation of the divine displeasure against the world is declared; and, therefore, the sin of the world is no longer a bar to acceptance. Thirdly, in its influence on man, it may be viewed as Redemption, universal as to the race, limited in its process and consummation to those who believe.[23]

Here Dr. Pope has not thought it necessary even to allude to governmental necessities and results. He employs a Biblical vocabulary and such modes of speaking as are not unknown to the Scriptures. In continuation of this thought, he says, in yet more unmistakable language:

As availing for man, by the appointment of God, it is no less than the satisfaction, provided by divine love, of the claims of divine justice upon transgression; which may be viewed, on the one hand, as an expiation of the punishment due to the guilt of human sin; and, on the other, as a propitiation of the divine displeasure, which is thus shown to be consistent with infinite good-will to the sinners of mankind. But the expiation of guilt and the propitiation of wrath are one and the same effect of the atonement. Both suppose the existence of sin and the wrath of God against it.[24]

Once more:

As the atonement avails for the human race, and is therefore ours, it must be

viewed as a vicarious satisfaction of the claims of divine justice or expiation of the guilt of sin, and propitiation of the divine favor.[25]

Dr. Pope now proceeds to the exegetical defense of these dogmatic definitions. There are two families of terms that must be at once brought forward in every discussion of this subject: the nouns ἱλασμός and καταλλαγή most fitly represent these two groups of terms and ideas. The first group is presented in three leading forms:

Christ is the Ἱλασμός, the virtue of the propitiation, and the Propitiator: *He is the propitiation for our sins*; not the Ἱλαστήρ, because the process of his propitiating is lost in the effect. He is the living Expiation. He is also the Ἱλαστήριον, the Kapporeth, or mercy-seat, according to the use of the word in the Septuagint, *Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation*, that is, as a mercy-seat, between himself and sinners. Or, if the word be an adjective, then *θῦμα* is understood, and he is a propitiatory sacrifice. As the high-priest he is said ἱλασκέθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας that is, to expiate sins;

though the English translation hides this meaning: *to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.*[26]

Now consider the second group of terms:

> The verb καταλλάσσειν signifies the virtue of the mediation of Christ as composing a difference between God and man, and καταλλαγή the result; the new relation in which the world stands to God, he being no longer an ἀντίδικος, and the world being no more an object of wrath. The context in the two passages where the verb is used shows that God is the antagonist.[27]

Coming now to discuss the specific idea of satisfaction as involved in expiation and propitiation, Dr. Pope says:

> As commonly used to signify the unlimited reparation made for the dishonor done to the majesty of holiness by sin, it has no direct, though abundant indirect, sanction in the New Testament. But it evermore blends with the idea of propitiation; God is propitious, or favorably brought near, to the entire race of mankind; there is now but one ἀνθρωπόκτονος for whom eternal right *shall take no satisfaction*. . . . But the idea as referred to the Divine Being is really twofold: it is the satisfaction of his unutterable love which provides the atonement; and it is the satisfaction of his eternal holiness which must be a consuming fire to evil.[28]

This is by no means identical with the doctrine advocated by Dr. Miley, that a sinner maybe at once possessed of the personal friendship of God and exposed to judicial penalty. It is true that the atonement is to be traced to God's love as its original. But that love does not exclude co-existent divine displeasure against sin and sinners. And in order that that love might have free course to the sinner and be glorified in his salvation, it gave

birth to the atonement, not as an outgrowth of governmental necessities, but as a demand arising among the divine attributes, and to remove difficulties interposed by the divine nature. This is very different from Dr. Miley's doctrine, that if the governmental difficulties were out of the way the personal displeasure could be removed without atonement.

The atonement is sometimes misapprehended. Horace Bushnell had the true doctrine exactly reversed when he maintained, in his "Forgiveness and Law," that God made the sacrifice of his Son in order to excite love and forgiveness in his own bosom toward the creature upon whom he had conferred so costly a gift, just as we find that large self-sacrifice on behalf of our enemies and their

interests substitutes hate and vengeance by love and forgiveness in our feelings and intentions. Such a system, or any other, beginning with the malignity of God toward his creatures, in whole or in part, dishonors God, and is viciously false. God is love, essentially and inalienably love. God's love was not born of the atonement, but the atonement of God's love. Man lost his place in the *approving* love of God, but not in his *benevolent* love. Antecedently to the atonement of Christ God loved the world: for "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." He did not give his Son that he might love the world. By this we understand that, while the righteous and rectoral principles of his character and government demanded the punishment of sin, and would have inflicted that punishment, he yearningly desired the salvation of his creatures. Else the incarnation and crucifixion had never taken place. He loved us while we were yet enemies, just as we love our children when we are about to inflict corporal punishment upon them. Upon the death of the Son, however, the race steps up on a new and higher plane before God. God stands in an altered relation to his creature. He not only has a desire to save, but he now has the ability to pardon, and at the same time not infringe upon the righteous demands of his character and law. Is this now, when we turn to man, unconditional? Has the sinner a claim upon God? or has the sacrifice of Christ purchased him a *right* of forgiveness? Is the commercial conception of the atonement, as held either by Augustinianism or Universalism, according to which the price has been paid, and the bond must be fulfilled by the delivery of the purchased possession, true? Here the

Calvinist and Universalist hold the same fundamental principle, for it matters not that the purchase in the one case is a part of the race, and in the other the whole. The questions asked above must be answered negatively; and we avoid Calvinism on one hand, and Universalism on the other, building firmly on the broad foundations of Arminian orthodoxy, when we consider that the demand for atonement lay in God or in the character of God, not in the value or number of the souls under the condemnation of violated law. The atonement accomplishes simply the removal of the divine disabilities, and God now obtains only the power to consistently pardon. It is not a question of the purchase of a given number of souls by the payment of a stipulated price, but a question of making

the pardon of *any* soul possible. Just the same atonement is required to make the justification of one sinner possible that would be required for an infinite number.

Such is the doctrine set forth by the learned and devout Danish prelate, Bishop Martensen:

But though we also teach that the essence of God is unchangeable love, we at the same time maintain that the active life of God's love in the world must needs have been interrupted by sin, and that a love whose holy and righteous claims could not thus be injured and wounded would not be true love. The notion of God's greatness which considers him too high to require an atonement differs nothing from the notion that he is too high to be grieved by sin, that as the atonement does not affect him, so neither does sin affect him. We, on the contrary, believe that sin is against God, that it does concern him, that it disturbs his divine relation toward us, and therefore we cannot rest satisfied with that seeming reconciliation which is effected on earth but not in heaven. He has only a superficial perception of sin who can rest satisfied with it. However much of pious energy we may grant to an Abelard, and to other Pelagian natures, experience teaches that those spirits who have felt the sting of sinfulness and the weight of human guilt, amid the struggles of an alarmed conscience, who have felt sin to be, not merely a disturbed relationship to an impersonal law, but a violation of their religious relations to the living God—St. Paul, for example, and Augustin, and Anselm, and Luther, and Pascal, and Hamann [and the Wesleys]—have been able to find consolation simply and alone by faith in a reconciled God; only then, when in faith they laid hold upon the gospel that the wrath of God was taken away, did love within them drive out fear.[29]

So Dr. Pope:

Propitiation, from *Prope*, near, indicates in the Bible that the favor and good pleasure of God is attracted to the sinner by the mediation of Jesus. HE IS THE PROPITIATION because in him God is nearer to man the sinner than even to man

the unfallen. The fact that holy wrath is turned away through the atoning satisfaction is a secret behind the incarnation: in the very essence of the Triune God. *Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son the Propitiation for our sins.* The profound truth remains, that the divine wrath and the divine love are revealed at once in Christ, but love must have the pre-eminence in our phraseology.[30]

This is sufficient refutation of the following argument of Dr. Miley's:

Why did the Father sacrifice the Son of his love in our redemption? It

could not have been from any need of personal propitiation toward us. The redeeming sacrifice itself, the fruit of his love to us, is proof to the contrary.[31]

Unquestionably all careful exegetes will agree that the noun καταλλαγή expresses

the divine virtue of that mediatorial work which reconciles in God himself love and holiness, justice and mercy: in God himself before the Reconciliation was exhibited in the world. Of the distinction between this atonement eternally in God and reconciliation in the world of time we must speak again. . . . We mean by THE ATONEMENT the whole economy of our Lord's saving intervention as consummated on the cross. It is the ἱλασμός and ἱλασκέσθαι which answers to the כִּפֶּר and the כֹּפֶר. Just as we employ the term redemption to designate Christ's work as saving man generally, and the term reconciliation to signify the ministry through which that salvation is proclaimed; so we use the term atonement to include the virtue of the redeeming work as propitiating the divine mercy to our race. In fact, it is the theological formula for all that belongs to that work.[32]

No systematic theologian has ever excelled Dr. Pope in exegetical skill. It would be difficult to find in the whole realm of theological writing a profounder appreciation of the exact teaching of Scripture than is expressed in the following passage, especially in the concluding sentences:

The divine HOLINESS is exhibited as conspicuously as the divine love, so far as concerns the process of redemption: love is supreme in the origination, and will be supreme at the end—for *mercy rejoiceth against judgment*, not over it, though over against it; but in the actual atoning work the justice of holiness, demanding the punishment and extermination of sin, is displayed in the most awful manner of which the human mind can form any conception. It is important to remember that Holy Scripture never makes such a distinction between the love and the holiness of God as theology thinks it necessary to establish. The mercy that provides and the justice that requires the atonement are one in the recesses of the divine nature. Their union or identity is lost to us in the thick darkness of the light which we cannot approach. The cross of Christ, or rather the whole mediation of the Redeemer, equally and at once reveals both. *Herein is love* —to quote once more the final revelation of Scripture on this subject—*not that we loved God, hut that he loved us, and sent his Son the Propitiation for our sins.* In our infirmity we

find it needful to correct our estimate of one attribute by appealing to the other. The Scripture scarcely condescends to that infirmity. It speaks of the divine ἀγάπη as ordering the whole economy of what is nevertheless an

ἱλασμός or propitiation, and of the divine εὐδοκία as ordering the whole economy of what is nevertheless a καταλλαγή. We shall hereafter see how these four words meet in the sacrifice of the cross, where love reigns through the infinite sacrifice of love.[33]

Could any thing be more beautifully or more truthfully said? The superficial theology of Dr. Miley's theory is driven away like chaff before the strong wind by such complete presentation of the whole content of the sacred writings. Dr. Pope is as careful as Dr. Miley to leave us in no doubt concerning his conception of the necessities and results of atonement:

> The change of relation is mutual: God lays aside his displeasure against mankind, being propitiated in the intervention of his Son; and all men, through the ministry of the Reconciliation, are invited to enter into a state of acceptance with God, laying aside their enmity.[34]

Dr. Pope does not for a moment entertain that superficial and sentimental error that the reconciliation is only of man to God, not of God to man. If our view must be one-sided and incomplete, our doctrine would be nearer the truth if it held only the great Biblical fact of the reconciliation of God to men:

> Not to betake ourselves to abstract principles, the Scripture must be our appeal. The few sentences containing that aspect of the Saviour's work which views it as the Reconciliation speak in their context of a divine wrath, and in such a way as to give wrath its uttermost meaning. In the classical Corinthian passage we read *not imputing their trespasses unto them*, which has behind it, or rather before it, that most solemn declaration. *Who, though he knew not sin*, was MADE SIN for us. These last words give the key to the whole doctrine; closing the statement of it with deep emphasis. . . . When he who *knew no sin was made sin for us*, the wrath of God against our transgression was expended upon our representative, and diverted from us. He reconciled the world to himself by removing from it, as a world, his eternal displeasure. What is now going on through the ministry is the winning of individual souls to the enjoyment of the divine peace. For the full interpretation of this classical passage it is necessary to consider more distinctly the meaning of both terms: Reconciliation and World. The entire world of mankind God is said to have reconciled to himself in Christ, inasmuch as the atoning sacrifice was the actual realization of a purpose which had been regarded as wrought out from the beginning of human history. An economy or relation of peace had always prevailed in his government of a sinful race. . . . The purpose of redemption was an eternal purpose. . . . There was in heaven an Atonement before the Atonement. . . . The term [Reconciliation] may be said to characterize the kind of administration the Supreme Ruler has exercised over a guilty race. . . . As

the world has received a Saviour or Deliverer, and the gospel is preached to the world, so the world has from the beginning had

the benefit of the amnesty. But a dispensation of forbearance BEFORE Christ is IN Christ a dispensation of perfect Peace. Hence the gospel is called the *ministry of reconciliation.* God is administering, through the stewards of this ministry, a system or economy of forgiveness and peace. The embassadors of Christ announce a general declaration of the divine good-will to the world. Their ministry is not so much to induce sinners to lay aside their opposition to God as to persuade them that God has laid aside his opposition to then, not imputing their trespasses. . . . There is nothing said here of a reconciliation between the upper intelligences and man, or between both united and God; it is evident that the atonement is a ground of amnesty in the divine government universal so far only as the human race is concerned. The cross belongs to the world, and to all the world. Its two arms stretch backward and forward, to the beginning and to the end of time. So it is in a parallel place: *For he is our Peace . . . that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby*; what enmity he slew is explained by the reconciliation UNTO GOD. The result is that the life of salvation reigns. . . . The race in its unity is, notwithstanding sin, placed in a relation of peace with the Supreme Ruler, so that the holy heavens can still canopy an unholy earth. . . . Our being reconciled never means our putting away our enmity, but the revelation in us of God's mercy. This is evident in the apostle's words to the Romans: *For if, when we were enemies*, under the displeasure of God, ἐχθροὶ ὄντες, we were reconciled to God, κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ, *by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled,* having become partakers of divine grace, *we shall be saved by his life. He is our Peace,* St. Paul says, just as he is our Saviour, our Lord, our Head. And those who *have received the Atonement*, or who are *justified by his blood*—that is, who do not reject the reconciliation which is announced to them in the gospel—have *peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* The preachers of the gospel declare the message of their embassy, and beseech men in Christ's stead: *Be ye reconciled to God.* But they mean only: Submit yourselves to the mercy of Heaven. St. Paul gives another expression to the same truth: he adds, *And came and preached peace*; after that description of the atonement already quoted, which speaks of his having *slain the enmity* on the cross.[35]

What a gospel! Glorious truth! How unspeakably great and precious the message of reconciliation committed to the embassador for Christ! What a response in peace, in joy unspeakable and full of glory, this gospel receives in Christian experience! How unanimous the testimony of ecumenical Methodism!

"The angel said unto them, Behold I bring you good tidings of

great joy, . . . and suddenly there was with the angel a multitude" praising and saying—Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας: *Glory to God in the highest*—this is one member of the angelic antiphony—*and upon earth peace among men of good-will*

281

—toward whom God is well-disposed—here is the responsive member.

Let historical theology, in concluding, render us some slight service. Referring to Socinianism, Dr. Pope says:

> It refuses to admit of any immutable qualities whether of justice or mercy in the divine nature, these being only expressions of his occasional will, called out, as it were, by the conduct of man. An eternal justice demanding punishment is inconsistent with an eternal mercy prompting to forgive. Satisfaction for sin is incompatible with love. Against this objection it is enough to say that it opposes the first principles of scriptural teaching concerning God, who is represented as reconciling in himself these opposite attributes by an atonement which is at once and equally an expression of both, and regulating his will. Thus our doctrine is safe from Socinian censure only when it first shuts itself up in God, and grasps the reconciliation of justice and mercy in the divine nature.[36] There are two everlasting safeguards of the truth: the constitution of the human mind, which bears witness to the wrath as well as the love of God, and the express revelation of Scripture concerning the reconciliation.[37]

Once more. In Dr. Pope's final historical summary the beautiful harmony and almost marvelous coincidence of Pope and Summers may be clearly seen:

> Most of the errors that have passed in review have sprung from failure to connect the three leading Biblical ideas: the atonement in God, as a necessity in the divine attributes; the reconciliation on earth, as vindicating to the universe the rectoral justice of God; and the exhibition of the redemption to man, as moving upon his conscience and will and heart. Here unite what are sometimes called the SUBSTITUTIONARY, the GOVERNMENTAL, and the MORAL INFLUENCE theories. The union of these is the scriptural doctrine, as it is set forth in Scripture; and especially in the Epistles of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John: the last giving in many particulars the finishing touches in the union of the Person and the Work of Christ. Neither of these theories is valid, standing alone. Each is necessary as the complement of the others. The doctrine would commend itself more than it does to the minds of all devout persons if justice was done to every aspect. The champion of either of these theories who thinks it necessary absolutely to deny the truth of the others proves that his own is wrong.[38]

The later theologian builds on the same foundation with the older. Watson in his "Theological Institutes," Part II., Chapter xx., develops *in extenso* a doctrine in all essential points in accord with that of Dr. Pope. The difference is that between the polemical and argumentative systematic theologian, who for several generations was the type of an English divine, and the exegetical, polished, brief, scholarly, uncombative treatment of the theologian

who is a master in all the rich developments of the most recent Biblical and theological learning both in England and in Germany. Many passages might be quoted from the familiar pages of this twentieth chapter of Watson; but in the special interpretation of the critical passages on which the doctrine turns this would be but to duplicate, in some cases very strikingly, the spirit and results of the quotations already made from Dr. Pope. On the doctrine of the atonement, Watson, Pope, and Summers are a unit.[39]]

§ 6. Governmental Aspect of Atonement.

The second aspect of the atonement refers to the well-being of the universe: in this we see its governmental importance. Let us suppose that Adam and his sinful posterity were forgiven by sheer prerogative, what would be the result? If the transgressors of our race were forgiven without any mediatory propitiation, would they not be induced to think very lightly of sin? Would they not be very likely to repeat their transgressions without reserve and without remorse? If the government makes nothing of the penalty, they would not think much of the precept, and so the whole race would become utterly lawless if it were possible to continue them upon the earth.

If sinners of a mortal race were allowed to transgress with impunity, pardon being granted without any satisfaction to the government under which they are placed, would not every demon in hell consider himself unjustly and cruelly treated in being punished for his revolt, however just his punishment might be, and really is?

If men were allowed to sin and then were pardoned without atonement—with or without regret for their transgressions—would not every angel in heaven be led to infer that obedience is not very

important, and that the peril of disloyalty is not so great? “God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell;” but if he spares men that sin, without satisfaction for their sin, would not the angels who kept their first estate of innocence and bliss be more likely to be influenced to sin by the impunity in the latter case, than to be restrained from it by the rigor of the former? Suppose the sinning race annihilated or

damned. That would strike terror into the minds of all intelligences, good and bad. None could complain of injustice; but none could “sing of mercy and of judgment.”

But the atonement displays the rectoral goodness of the universal Sovereign, who is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works.

The satisfaction demanded for sin, duly considered, will deter men from sinning. The cross shows them that it is, in the superlative degree, “an evil thing, and bitter.”

Devils will see in the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ more clearly than in their own damnation the exceeding sinfulness of sin.

Angels, as they gaze upon the illustrious Sufferer in the garden and on the tree, are filled with horror at the very thought of transgression. Not all the bliss of heaven does so much to confirm them in virtue and happiness as the expiatory sacrifice of Christ. The schoolmen were probably right when they represented the atonement as extending collaterally to angels. It was not intended for the redemption of fallen angels, who are past redemption; nor for the salvation of the holy angels, for they need no salvation; no Saviour, for they never sinned. But it can so bear upon them as to confirm them in their loyalty and bliss; it does exalt them to greater heights in glory; it furnishes them with new themes of praise, and those heavenly “harpers harping with their harps” make the celestial arches ring with the song of redemption, though they themselves cannot share directly in redeeming grace and dying love.

They have other associates, colonies from this lower world to share their joys and to heighten them, and to impart to them a vastly more extended knowledge of God than they could otherwise obtain. This seems to be what the apostle meant when he said, “Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable

riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God." (Eph. iii. 8–10.) So that still more suggestive passage in Col. i. 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through

the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."

In a characteristically curious discourse on this passage, Dr. Donne observes:

> All things in heaven and earth, says the apostle. And that is so large as that Origen need not to have extended it to hell too, and conceive out of this place a possibility that the devils themselves shall come to a reconciliation with God. But to all in heaven and earth it appertains. Consider we how. First then, there is a reconciliation of them in heaven to God, and then of them on earth to God, and then of them in heaven, and them in earth to one another, by the blood of his cross. If we consider them in heaven to be those who are gone up to heaven from this world by death, they had the same reconciliation as we; either by reaching the hand of faith forward to lay hold upon Christ before he came (which was the case of all under the law), or by reaching back that hand to lay hold upon all that he had done and suffered when he was come (which is the case of those that are dead before us in the profession of the gospel). All that are in heaven and were upon earth are reconciled one way, by application of Christ in the Church, so that, though they be now in heaven, yet they had their reconciliation here upon earth. But if we consider those who are in heaven, and have been so from the first minute of their creation, angels, why have they, or how have they, any reconciliation? How needed they any, and then how is this o Christ applied unto them? They needed a confirmation, for the angels were created in blessedness, but not in perfect blessedness—they might fall, they did fall. To those that fell can pertain no reconciliation, no more than to those who die in their sins; for *quod homini mors angelis casus* —the fall of the angels wrought upon them as the death of a man does upon him; they are both equally incapable of change to better. But to those angels that stood, their standing being of grace, and their confirmation being not one transient act in God done at once, but a continual succession and emanation of daily grace, belongs this reconciliation by Christ, because all matter of grace, and where any deficiency is to be supplied, whether by way of reparation, as in man, or by way of confirmation, as in angels,

proceeds from the cross, from the merits of Christ. Thus things in heaven are reconciled to God by Christ; and things on earth too. First, the creature, as St. Paul speaks.

Donne here alludes to the famous and obscure passage in Rom. viii. 21, where, however, "the creature" need not be explained as "other creatures than men." He continues:

But the most proper and most literal sense of these words is, that all things in heaven and earth be reconciled to God (that is, to his glory, to a fitter disposition to glorify him), by being reconciled to one another in Christ; that in him, as Head of the Church, they in heaven, and we upon earth, be united together as one body in the communion of saints. For this text hath a conformity and a harmony with that to the Ephesians, and in sense, as well as in words, is the same, that God might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in

heaven and which are on earth even in him; where the word which we translate *to gather*, doth properly signify *recapitulare* [ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι], to bring all things to their first head, to God's first purpose, which was that angels and men, united in Christ Jesus, might glorify him eternally in the kingdom of heaven. Then are things in heaven restored and reconciled, says St. Augustin, when good men have repaired the ruin of the bad angels, and filled their places. And then are things on earth restored and reconciled, when God's elect children are delivered from the corruptions of this world to which even they are subject here (Gregory)—when men by humility are exalted to those places from which angels fell by pride, then are all things in heaven and earth reconciled in Christ.

We are inclined to indorse substantially these views, as also those in the same line of thought in Whitby's note on this passage, with which Bloomfield and many other judicious critics concur. He says:

Ἀποκαταλλάξαι, to reconcile, say Hesychius, Suidas, and Phavorinus, signifies φιλοποιῆσαι, to make friends, or to reduce persons to their former amity. This by the Fathers is thus explained, that whilst man continued in his obedience to God, angels and men were in a perfect friendship, but when men became disobedient to their Sovereign Lord, the angels became averse to them; but God being reconciled to us by the death of his Son, they also became friends and ministering spirits to us, and we became of the same Church and body with them, under the same Head, Christ Jesus (Heb. xii. 22); and so all things in heaven and earth were gathered into one, Christ. (Eph. i. 10).

Olshausen hesitates at this interpretation, being strongly inclined to think that Paul asserts in both passages the doctrine of

"universal restoration"—that Christ purposed the restoration of "the harmony of the universe," men, angels, and demons, the whole creation, rational, irrational, and inanimate, improperly pressing Rom. viii. 17 into his service without absolutely affirming that such a restoration will actually take place.

Rotherham renders literally, "And through him to reconcile fully the all things unto him, making peace through the blood of his cross, whether the things upon the earth or the things in the heavens."

The neuter τὰ πάντα does not imply that inanimate things are embraced; it rather expresses the grand totality, *the all* in heaven and *the all* on earth—all the unfallen angels and all the fallen race of men. That is the design of the Saviour's atonement, and it will be realized in the case of all, except sinners among men, who "neglect the great salvation."

We do not know whether any other worlds besides heaven, earth, and hell are inhabited by moral intelligences; but if they

are, the inhabitants of those worlds may have heard of the fall of man, and that a gracious amnesty has been granted him. They would naturally inquire on what terms fallen man has been reprieved, or pardoned, or restored to the favor of his offended Sovereign. If forgiveness were granted to him by a mere executive prerogative, without satisfaction or propitiation, and they were apprised of it, they would lose all respect for the divine government, a fatal blow would be struck at their fealty, and their innocence and happiness could be no longer assured to them. The reign of law—moral law—must pervade the universe; the reasonableness of the precept and the righteousness of the penalty must be kept perpetually and distinctively before the eyes of all the subjects of God's moral government. But neither the one nor the other will be so exhibited if the former be infringed and the latter be unenforced. We have no ground to suppose that any moral beings in the universe will keep from sin and consequent suffering unless the law is satisfied by every sinner or by a divine Substitute, such as has been provided for man's redemption.

We are not left to mere conjecture on this subject. So far as this principle is concerned, if there are any moral beings in Sirius, for example, they must be under the same moral law as angels and men. Now we know how angels stand related to man in view of his

sin and redemption. We have nothing to do with the angelology of the pseudo-Dionysius and the schoolmen. The Holy Scriptures furnish us sufficient information in the premises. We know that the angels are holy, benevolent, social, and curious beings.

It is remarkable that though the Bible says so much about angels, the names of but two of these celestial spirits are given in the sacred volume—Michael and Gabriel. The names of two others are given in the Apocrypha, Raphael and Uriel, which have been made familiar to us by the poets. All these names end in *-el* (God), and while the individuality of each may be recognized, still each may designate some distinctive property of the heavenly host. All the angels, doubtless, are holy, benevolent, social, and curious spirits; yet each order of these principalities and powers in the heavenly places may be distinguished in regard to one particular property more than any other. Michael means "Who is like God?" The name calls up that magnificent

passage in the song of Moses, Ex. xv. 11: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" This occurs in the song of deliverance, the song of victory over Pharaoh and his host: hence Moses uses that bold anthropomorphism, "The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name." (Verse 3.) As Michael is "the fighting archangel," this may have suggested his name. Three of the inspired writers speak of him, and all present him to us as a great warrior, contending against the enemies of God and his people, and bravely defending the cause of truth and righteousness. In the tenth chapter of Daniel, a man-like angel is represented as informing the prophet that "Michael, one of the chief princes"—specially designated as the prince of Israel ("your prince")—came to help him against "the prince of the kingdom of Persia." So in the twelfth chapter it is predicted, "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people." So in Jude 9 he appears again in character, jealous for the divine honor. "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." And more eminently so in Rev. xii. 7: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not."

As might have been expected, Milton makes good use of this in his great epic. In the sixth book he represents the Most High as sending "Michael, of celestial armies prince," to oppose the devil and all his hosts "in the cause of God and his Messiah." In this cause he wages battle; we need not say with what result. So when Adam and Eve are to be banished from Paradise because of their transgression, with singular propriety Michael has this behest in charge. He is sent with the "choice of flaming warriors from among the cherubim" to "drive out the sinful pair—from hallowed ground, the unholy." How ready are Michael and his angels to go on these errands! and how faithfully they execute them! They are holy, and they can have no sympathy with the unholy, whether demons or men. But for the same reason, if men can be restored to their fealty, and receive the image of God which they had lost, then angels

rejoice in the glorious fact, and are gladly reconciled to those who are thus reconciled to their Sovereign.

> And saints and angels join to sing
> The growing empire of their King.

Gabriel means "a man of God." The name also denotes strength. He is the news-carrier of heaven; and he comes to earth with messages of peace. Daniel calls him "the man Gabriel." He comes to the prophet to make him understand visions, and to give him skill and understanding, and to tell him, as highly favored of God, the time when the Messiah should make his advent. (Dan. viii., ix.) And so Luke represents him as sent to Zacharias to predict the birth and mission of the harbinger of the Messiah. "I am Gabriel," says he, "that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee these glad tidings." And it was the same Gabriel that announced to the Virgin that she was to be the mother of the Messiah. And who can doubt that it was the same Gabriel that brought the good tidings of the Saviour's birth to the shepherds, and who led the chorus of the heavenly host in singing the *Gloria in Excelsis* on that joyful occasion? Benevolent as he is, Gabriel cannot tolerate sin, nor have any fellowship with sinners. Milton represents him as having the charge of Paradise—

> that to this happy place
> No evil thing approach or enter in.

He sends him forth as next to Michael in military prowess to fight against "the banded powers of Satan." But still he is the angel of peace, a minister of grace. If he fights it is to conquer a peace. He heralds the advent of the Prince of Peace, and proclaims: "Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace, good-will toward men." And so Dante describes him as full of "buxomness and free delight."

For that he bore the palm
Down unto Mary, when the Son of God
Vouchsafed to clothe him in terrestrial weeds.

Who except man himself and his great Redeemer could be more interested in the redemption of the world than this courier spirit, who loves to fly on messages of grace?

Raphael means "the medicine of God." The name is well chosen. He is brought out in character in the Book of Tobit, and is thus spoken of by Dante:

Gabriel, and Michael, and him who made
Tobias whole.

What a pleasing part is assigned to this "affable archangel" in the Paradise Lost, where he is spoken of as

Raphael, the sociable spirit, that deigned
To travel with Tobias, and secured
His marriage with the seven times wedded maid!

The grotesque demonology, as well as angelology, of the post-exile Jews comes out in the Book of Tobit, but it shows the opinions of the Jews in regard to ministering angels, and they could not be far wrong in thus representing the angels as taking an interest in the common affairs of human life. They enjoy society—they are eminently social beings, and Raphael is thus their type. Earth as revolted was cut off from communication with angels, and the strict quarantine was so enforced that the loyal subjects of God's realm could have no intercourse with rebel men. It would have been constructive rebellion for them so to do. With their social feelings how they must have deplored the interdict thus laid on the revolted province! And then how much must they have rejoiced when the blockade was removed, and the intercourse between heaven and earth was re-opened, through the mediation of the Son of God!

Angels descend with songs again,
And earth repeats the loud amen!

Uriel means “the light of God,” or God is my light or fire. Hence Milton (iii. 690) says he was regent of the sun, and held the sharpest-sighted spirit of all in heaven. It is Uriel who,

gliding through the even
On a sunbeam, swift as a shooting star,

descends to the gate of Paradise to warn Gabriel, who had charge of it, that some evil spirit, in the shape of a good angel, was seeking to enter.

Uriel is brought to view in 2 Esdras, where he is employed to make known many secrets to Esdras, showing that he was deeply interested in the affairs of the Church and people of God. The story, though fabulous, is instructive. Angels are curious beings—they are inquisitive. They excel in intellectual strength, and they have acquired vast stores of knowledge, but their appetite grows by that with which it is supplied. They dwell, as it were, in the sun, and enjoy its illuminations. When man

was created, “the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.” Doubtless they wondered what would be the character and destiny of the new-born race. When man fell, the wonder grew: what now will be his fate? With all their far-reaching and deep-sounding powers they could find no remedy for the fallen world. But when the gracious reprieve was granted, and they were allowed to mingle again with the sons of men, how intently did they study promise and prophecy and type, to solve the mysterious problem! And when the Son of God became incarnate, how closely did they mark all he said and did, all that was said and done to him, while they ministered unto him, during his whole course, private and public, from the manger to the cross, from the tomb to the throne! Nor is their curiosity yet satisfied, for they still desire to look into these things. “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” (Heb. i. 14.) They do all they can to bring the sinner to repentance, and how greatly do they rejoice over every sinner that repenteth—not only because, as benevolent beings they are glad of the change on the sinner’s account, and as holy beings, because the empire of righteousness is thus extended, and as social beings because another

congenial spirit is added to their society—but because also they get a fresh insight into the mysteries of redeeming grace and dying love! How intently do they mark all the developments of the divine life in the case of every saint! They are present in all our solemn services.

Angels now are hov'ring round us,
Unperceived they mix the throng,
Wond'ring at the love that crowned us,
Glad to join the holy song.

With what avidity do they take the dying saint, though poor, like Lazarus, on their purple pinions, and bear him to the skies! The poet says:

And all for love, and nothing for reward.

O no; we do not believe—angels do not believe in such disinterested benevolence. "Self-love leads to social," in their case as well as in ours. Benevolent, of course, they are, but they look sharply to their own interests. How do they ply the glorified saints with their curious questions? They may give the *quid pro quo*. They can impart to glorified saints a great deal of information; but they can get, and do get, a great deal of information

from them. Angels are theological students, sitting at the feet of redeemed men, and learning from them the mysteries of redemption. Thus "unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places is made known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"—"which things the angels desire to look into." (Eph. iii. 10, 11; 1 Pet. i. 12.)

Every angel in heaven is interested in the atonement of Christ made for fallen man. As holy, benevolent, social, and curious beings, they are deeply concerned in this great mystery—its ground and development, its design and accomplishment—and to all eternity they will make it the matter of their meditations, the subject of their songs. What subject more suitable, more worthy of the study of men or angels?

Angels are men of a superior kind—
Angels are men in lighter habits clad—
High o'er celestial mountains winged in flight;

Nor are our brothers thoughtless of their kin,
Yet absent; but not absent from their love.
Michael has fought our battles; Raphael sung
Our triumphs; Gabriel on our errands flown,
Sent by the Sovereign.

And we may add Uriel's powerful mind is lost in pondering

Dying love's mysterious cause.

§ 7. Moral Aspect of Atonement.

The third aspect of the atonement regards the interests of God's rebellious subjects thus favored: herein we discover its moral bearings.

As far as the act of propitiating the Deity is concerned, and perhaps it may be added, the bearing of it on other subjects of God's empire, Christ might have possibly made the atonement by means less demonstrative and affecting than those which he adopted. But every thing which he did and suffered for man's redemption seems peculiarly adapted to reconcile man to God as well as to reconcile God to man. It is in particular adapted to promote these five ends:

1. To produce in the redeemed sinner a sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin.

As we cannot conceive of any other method by which sinners might be saved, and as we may reasonably infer that there could

be no other, else the Eternal God's Eternal Son would not have humbled himself by his incarnation and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, we cannot meditate upon this wonderful economy without being deeply impressed with the exceeding sinfulness of sin. We do not now mean the sin of those who denied and betrayed and crucified this Paragon of virtue and Benefactor of man, but the sin of every sinner for whom he died. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." (1 Pet. ii. 24.) He not only died *for* our sins, but *by* our sins. He sunk beneath the accumulated load of "the sin of the world." It is something more than rhetoric and poetry when in

our sermons and songs we speak of our sins murdering the Son of God. Thus Charles Wesley:

Beneath *my* load he faints and dies;
I filled his soul with pangs unknown;
I caused those mortal groans and cries;
I killed the Father's only Son!

In this light we can have some conception of what the apostle meant when he wrote of the apostates who "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Surely *deicide* is the culmination of crime! The apostle could not tell the sore punishment of which he is worthy "who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing." (Heb. vi. 6; x. 29.)

Paul uttered a great truth when he said "that sin by the commandment might be exceeding sinful." (Rom. vii. 13.) But we may say with a deeper emphasis, that sin by the atonement appears appallingly sinful. It caused the death of the Son of God, and its turpitude is so great that it cannot be expiated but by his death. It is of so deep a dye that it cannot be washed away but by the blood of God.

2. To produce in the sinner, awakened and convinced of sin, a penitent renunciation of it.

"True repentance is a grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby a sinner, from the sense of his sins, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it to God, with full purpose of, and endeavors after, future obedience."

293

This is well called *evangelical* repentance. It is a grace of the Holy Spirit, and that was procured by the mediation of Christ; it implies conviction of sin, and that, as we have seen, results from a sight of its turpitude in the light of the cross; it is excited by an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, for, as we have seen, God cannot show mercy to the sinner except through Christ, and apart from God's mercy no sinner can have either the will or the power to repent; it involves grief for sin and hatred to it, and it is said, "They shall look on him whom they have pierced, and mourn;" then there is the essence of repentance—renunciation of sin and turning to God, with a determination to bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

The cross alone is the lever which lifts us out of the horrible pit and miry clay of sin. Thus repentance, from beginning to end, is produced by the atonement. The conviction which precedes, the contrition which accompanies, and the renunciation of sin which completes, repentance—all come from the cross. As might be expected, our doctrinal and evangelical poets treat largely on this. With what pathos does C. Wesley set forth this point in that inimitable outburst, Hymn 392:

Hearts of stone, relent, relent.
Break, by Jesus' cross subdued!
See his body mangled, rent,
Covered with a gore of blood!
Sinful soul, what hast thou done?
Murdered God's eternal Son.

In giving his experience John Newton gives the experience of every penitent sinner in that vivid, realistic poem, Hymn 435, entitled, "Subdued by the Cross:"

In evil long I took delight,
Unawed by shame or fear,
Till a new object struck my sight.
And stopped my wild career.

A steady look at the cross will break the heart of any sinner. This is the work of every minister of the gospel, to hold up the cross before the sinner, and to keep it constantly in his view, until the exclamation shall be extorted, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."

3. The atonement is adapted to produce in the penitent sinner a fiducial reliance on the divine clemency.

It cuts off all doubt, all misgiving, in regard to the placability of the offended Sovereign. None can doubt his willingness to pardon all who penitently rely on the mediation of Christ, as he is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world"—the sacrifice which God demanded, provided, and accepted. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. viii. 32). He gave his Son for the very reason that he might give every thing else—pardon,

holiness, and heaven—to all who do not reject the great salvation. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) The ground of the tender of pardon, as set forth in the atonement, shows that there is no bar to its bestowment except the unbelief of those to whom it is offered, as that unbelief has in it the very essence of disobedience and rebellion. God has, as it were, taken pains to assure sinners that he is not only disposed to forgive them, but that he can do so on terms honorable and safe to all concerned. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 21–26.)

The importance which God attaches to the atonement, and the peculiar measures which he adopts to urge it upon our acceptance, making our salvation certain if we accept it, and our damnation certain if we reject it—all this shows the divine mercy, and is admirably adapted to elicit the faith of the penitent sinner. This is how the apostle argues: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." "And all things are of God,

who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to-wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are embassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 14–21.)

Faith has an ethical element in it—the will and affections as well as the intellect are involved—so that a man may or may not believe, and hence the decree: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) But it would seem that no penitent sinner can fail to confide in the pardoning mercy of God, if he has a proper view of the atonement of Christ. Doubt is impossible in the sight of the cross.

Now I have found the ground wherein
Sure my soul's anchor may remain:
The wounds of Jesus, for my sin
Before the world's foundation slain;
Whose mercy shall unshaken stay
When heaven and earth are fled away.

All that any penitent sinner has to do is to believe the record which God hath given of his Son—that he has made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and that he

Who did for every sinner die
Hath surely died for me!

Thus receiving the atonement, it is impossible to withhold fiducial reliance on the clemency of a sin-forgiving God.

4. The atonement is adapted to produce in the pardoned sinner a grateful appreciation of the love of Christ.

The love of benevolence begets the love of gratitude. "We love him because he first loved us." No wonder the pardoned penitent in the gospel was led to the Saviour's feet with her tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and anointed them with the ointment. She had been much forgiven, and therefore she loved much. No service is considered too great, no sacrifice too severe, to be performed and endured, in return for the

great love wherewith he hath loved us, and the immense outlay of service and suffering involved in its manifestation.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small:
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all!

Indeed, he who has no sentiment of gratitude toward the Saviour, and who does not endeavor to make some return for his amazing grace, gives ground for a suspicion that he has not yet received the atonement.

5. The atonement is adapted to produce in the pardoned sinner a generous imitation of the divine philanthropy.

That is Paul's argument: "The love of Christ constraineth us." By the love which Christ had shown to him, he was constrained to love sinners, and to labor for their salvation. Those who fully imbibe this sentiment are made very nearly like their Lord. Like him, were it possible, they would be held accursed, if thus they could save sinners. "Yea," says the apostle, "and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith"—that is, if his blood be poured out as a libation in the cause of their salvation—"I Joy and rejoice with you all." (Phil. ii. 17.) This is an imitation of the divine philanthropy. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." (John iii. 16; iv. 10, 11.)

There was no necessity that the cross should be the instrument of the Saviour's death, with the shedding of his blood, and the tragical circumstances connected with his death: if he had seen proper he could have offered himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world without these accidents; but certainly they do in a wonderful manner affect our minds. Donne emphasizes this: "Peace was made by the blood of his cross—by blood; to save blood, and yet by blood; and by his blood, his who was victoriously to triumph in this peace; and by the blood of his cross, that is, his death: the blood of his circumcision, the blood of his agony, the blood of his scourging, was not enough—it must be, and so it was, the blood of his cross." Hence the cross is

the ideal exponent of his atonement—not any material representative of it, which originates in superstition and tends to idolatry; but the conception of it in our minds. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Gal. vi. 14.) There is a wonderful magnetic power in the cross. The sympathy

extends so far and goes so deep that there is in the experience of the true believer a kind of repetition of the Saviour's death. "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Gal. ii. 20.)

In this subjective view of the atonement, we see how the moral and the mystical blend with the propitiatory elements of the Saviour's mediation.

We cannot imitate the Son of God in atoning for our own sins or the sins of others; but this we can do, we can plead his propitiatory sacrifice for the forgiveness of our own sins and the sins of others; and we can, in our sufferings for others, "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, in our flesh, for his body's sake, which is the Church." (Col. i. 24.) His atonement works to that end. "Jesus Christ before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession" (1 Tim. vi. 13.)—dying as a martyr for the truth which he came to reveal—sealing his testimony with his blood: so we, in the same spirit, and to the same end, can and should "love not our lives unto the death," but freely offer them in the defense of the gospel, "dying champions for our God." It is in the sight of the cross that we are compelled to exclaim:

My life, my blood, I here present.
If for thy truth they may be spent.

"He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb before his shearers is dumb, so opened he not his mouth." (Acts viii. 32.) "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness:

by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." (1 Pet. ii. 21–25.) In this wonderfully comprehensive passage, how admirably are blended the propitiatory, the moral, and the mystical elements of the Saviour's mediation! With what pathos and beauty,

and at the same time profound and subtile analysis and development, is this subject presented by the sweet psalmist of our Israel:

Saviour of all, what hast thou done?
What hast thou suffered on the tree?
Why didst thou groan thy mortal groan,
Obedient unto death for me?
The mystery of thy passion show,
The end of all thy griefs below.

Pardon and grace and heaven to buy,
My bleeding sacrifice expired;
But didst thou not my Pattern die,
That, by thy glorious Spirit fired,
Faithful to death I might endure.
And make the crown by suffering sure?

Thou didst the meet example leave
That I might in thy footsteps tread:
Might, like the Man of Sorrows, grieve
And groan and bow with thee my head;
Thy dying in my body bear.
And all thy state of suffering share.

Whether or not we express ourselves in measure and rhyme, it is impossible to discuss the subject without soaring into the realm of poetry. No matter where—in narrative, epistle, or prophecy, in sermon as well as in song—the inspired writers use the most pathetic language, which it has been so easy to weave into the hymnology of the Church. Without it how cold and barren would be all our worship! But this discussion must close. We conclude with an extract from a German hymn on the crucifixion, translated by John Wesley:

My Saviour, how shall I proclaim?
How pay the mighty debt I owe?
Let all I have and all I am
Ceaseless to all thy glory show.

Too much to thee I cannot give.
Too much I cannot do for thee;
Let all thy love and all thy grief
Graven on my heart forever be!

1. Miley, “The Atonement in Christ,” p 23.↩
2. Miley, “Atonement in Christ,” pp. 262–265.↩
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 276–278.↩
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 125–126.↩
5. The matter here inserted, as well as that of § 1, has been before printed in an article, “The Methodist Doctrine of Atonement,” which I published in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* (New York) for April, 1884.—T.↩
6. Miley, “Atonement in Christ,” p. 74.↩
7. *Ibid.*, p. 73.↩
8. *Ibid.*, p. 74.↩
9. *Ibid.*, p. 61.↩
10. *Ibid.*, p. 63.↩
11. *Ibid.*, p. 75.↩
12. *Ibid.*, p. 226.↩
13. *Ibid.*, p. 228; italicizing added.↩
14. *Ibid.*, p. 232.↩
15. *Ibid.*, p. 229.↩
16. *Ibid.*, p. 233.↩
17. *Ibid.*, p. 233.↩
18. *Ibid.*, p. 239.↩
19. *Ibid.*, p. 247.↩
20. *Ibid.*, p. 249.↩
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 249, 250; italicizing added.↩
22. Miley, “Atonement in Christ,” p. 272; italicizing added.↩
23. Pope, “Compendium of Christian Theology,” Vol. II., p. 263.↩
24. *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 264.↩
25. Pope, “Compendium of Christian Theology,” Vol. II., p. 269.↩
26. *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 272.↩
27. *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 272.↩
28. *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 274.↩
29. “Christian Dogmatics,” pp. 305, 306.↩
30. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., p. 275.↩
31. Miley, “Atonement,” etc., p. 272.↩
32. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., p. 275.↩
33. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., pp. 273, 279.↩
34. *Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 282.↩
35. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., pp. 283–287. Paragraphs and sentences from all these pages have been grouped for quotation.↩
36. Pope, “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., p. 310.↩
37. *Ibid.*, p. 312.↩
38. *Ibid.*, p. 314.↩
39. The matter here inserted, pp. 268–282, is also taken from the article mentioned in the foot-note on p. 261.—T.↩

Book III. Christ's Resurrection, Ascension, Session, and Second Coming; and Eschatology: the Doctrine of the Last Things.

Article III. Of The Resurrection of Christ.

301

Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

Introduction.

This article corresponds with Article IV. of the Anglican Confession, except that instead of "death" Mr. Wesley put "the dead"—which agrees better with the Latin *a mortuis*—and omitted the words "flesh, bones, and," after the words "his body." We do not know that he anywhere assigns a reason for this omission. The title of the article inadequately sets forth its contents. The article treats of the Resurrection of Christ, his Ascension to heaven and Session there, and his Return to Judgment [these several topics constituting what theologians usually treat as Christ's "Estate of Exaltation"]. As there is no separate article on Eschatology in the Confession, and as future retribution is a sequence of Christ's last mediatorial character as the Judge of all men at the last day, what is proper to be said on Eschatology may conveniently be arranged under this article. Our treatment will, therefore, be presented in two parts:

1. Christ's Resurrection, Ascension, Session, and Second Coming;
2. Eschatology, the doctrine of the Last Things.

Part I. The Resurrection, Ascension, Session, and Second Coming of Christ.

Chapter I. The Nature of Christ's Resurrection Body.

§ 1. Bishops Browne and Williams on the Omitted Words.

302

The article says, "Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature."

The Anglican article says: "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with *flesh, hones,* and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven." This seems to teach that Christ not only rose with a body of flesh and bones, but that he ascended with the flesh and bones to heaven.

So Bishop Browne, after citing the scriptures which prove that Jesus rose in the same body that was laid in the grave, says: "All this connected together seems to prove the identity of our Lord's body after his resurrection, at his ascension, and so on, even till his coming to judgment, with the body in which he suffered, and in which he was buried; and so fully justifies the language used in the article of our Church."

It is strange that he does not see the fallacy that lurks in this argument. He palpably contradicts his own statement when he goes on to say that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and that the glorified body is "a spiritual body," as the apostle states. Bishop Browne cites from Irenaeus, "the reception of Jesus Christ into heaven in the flesh;" and from Damasus: "If any one shall not acknowledge that Christ is set down at the right hand of the Father, in the same flesh which he took here, let him be anathema;" and similar passages from other

303

Fathers, which he understands in the same sense; and also the rubric at the end of the Communion Service, saying:

> The rubric, after explaining that by kneeling at the communion no adoration is intended either to the "sacramental bread and wine," or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood, adds, "The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it

being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." This rubric was first inserted in the second Service-book of Edward VI. It was omitted in the Prayer-book in Elizabeth's reign, probably from a wish not to offend the many persons of Lutheran sentiments then in connection with the Church. It was restored in the last revision, in the reign of Charles II., at the request of the Puritan divines.

In another note, speaking of the spiritual body, he says:

There may be a difficulty in reconciling this doctrine—which is the plain doctrine of Scripture and the primitive Christians—with the language of the rubric. If they be at variance, the language of a not very carefully worded rubric, adopted not without some hesitation by the Reformers, ought not to be pressed; but it is plain that the writers of the rubric did not mean by the words "natural body" to convey the same idea as St. Paul attaches to the term in 1 Cor. xv. The doctrine which they meant to teach was only that we must not consider the manhood of Christ changed into his Godhead.

Bishop Williams, of Connecticut, comes to the aid of Bishop Browne:

The word used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. is ψυχικόν (soul-ish), and this can hardly be supposed to be the meaning of "natural" in the rubric at the end of the Communion Service. Had this latter word been written in Greek, it would have been φυσικόν. It does so read in a Greek translation of the book of Common Prayer printed at Cambridge in 1665, and published with the Apocrypha and New Testament. There can therefore be no contradiction between St. Paul's words and the rubric, unless it can be proved that ψυχή and φύσις are synonymous.

Very good; but still both bishops, we surmise, would like to be well rid of the rubric. They cannot reconcile the broad statement that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven"—or as in the article, his "flesh and bones"—with Paul's statement that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Hence we do not regret the omission of the words from our recension of the article.

As we have it, there is still some ambiguity, which might be removed by dividing the article into two parts, thus: "Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with ail things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature. He then ascended to heaven, with his glorified body, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day." This is

doubtless the meaning of the article, and this Mr. Wesley most

likely had in view when he omitted the words in question.

§ 2. Errors Condemned by the Article.

The reality and completeness of Christ's resurrection are set forth with so much distinctness and emphasis, because infidels assert that he did not rise in any sense, and certain heretics hold that he did not rise with a perfect bodily organization.

Among the Jews, the Sadducees and the Essenes denied the resurrection of the body, and among the early Christians there were heretics who said "that there is no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 12), and others, "of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already" (2 Tim. ii. 18), like Swedenborgians and other modern fanatics. The *Docetae,* Manichees, and others, who denied the reality of Christ's body, denied, of course, the reality of the resurrection. The Cerinthians said Christ had not risen, but was to rise. Apelles said Christ assumed an airy body when he descended from heaven, which was resolved into its pristine elements when he ascended, his spirit alone returning to heaven. Hermogenes said his body v/as lodged in the sun. Others held that "the flesh of Christ is in the heavens, devoid of sense, as a sheath, Christ being withdrawn from it." Theodoret accuses Eutyches of holding that the Godhead alone rose from the dead, because he held that there is but one nature in Christ, the human being absorbed in the divine.

In opposition to all these infidel and heretical notions, the article asserts that "Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven." This is emphatically opposed to Docetism in all its forms.

§ 3. Modern Docetism Refuted.

It is marvelous with what tenacity Docetism holds on to the Church. Origen, who is not numbered with the Docetists, seems to approach very near to Docetism. He held that Christ rose from the dead with a glorified body. Many of the Eastern theologians adopted some of his Docetic notions. They held that Christ rose

with a spiritual body, because he entered into the room where the disciples were assembled, the doors being shut! We do not much wonder that Origen, and men of his

spiritualizing turn, should talk in this style; but we are surprised to read such a passage as this in Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles:

> Even before his ascension he is said to have come and stood in the midst of his disciples, where the doors were shut for fear of the Jews (John xx. 19). On another occasion he is said to have vanished out of their sight (Luke xxiv. 31). Again, his appearing to them "in another form" (Mark xvi. 12), and the disciples going to Emmaus not at once knowing him (Luke xxiv. 16), seem to show that there was some change in the appearance, as well as in the properties, of his body. Though his body had not ceased to be the same body which it was before his death, it yet appears to have received some degree of glorification, and to have been invested with some supernatural qualities.

What confusion of thought is here! How it contradicts what he has said about the resurrection body of Christ—"that our Lord arose from the grave in the same body in which he was buried, with flesh and bones"—as he demonstrated to Thomas (John xx. 25–28) and to the disciples (Luke xxiv. 36–40). "Thus it is clear that our Lord's body, after he rose from the grave, was that body in which he was buried, having hands and feet, and flesh and bones, capable of being handled, and in which he spoke and ate and drank (Luke xxiv. 42, 43)."

And yet, forsooth, this was a spiritual, glorified body! Better say at once with the ancient heretics, and with a learned Swedenborgian, the late Professor Bush, of New York, that the body of Christ which was raised was not the identical body which was crucified, but another and spiritual body. Some who adopt the notion that the body of Christ was glorified at the resurrection remind us that Jesus did not say, "A spirit hath not flesh and *blood* as ye see me have," but "flesh and bones!" We have no patience with such trifling. As if there could be flesh and bones—respiration, speech, eating and drinking, and all the other functions and actions of physical life—without blood!

As to the puerile argument that Jesus went into the room while the doors were shut, it has been a thousand times shown that if there was any miracle about it, it was a miracle of omniscience, not of omnipotence—indeed, it was no proper work for omnipotence to

put flesh and bones through a door without opening it! Christ knew where the disciples were assembled, and he opened the door, entered, and showed himself unexpectedly to them. Surprised as they were, they thought they saw a phantom. But did they not think so when they saw him walking upon the

waters (John vi.)? and did be do that in a spiritual, glorified body before his death? As to assuming a visage and general appearance different from that by which he was known to his disciples before his crucifixion—so that for the time being "their eyes were holden that they should not know him," until "their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight"—or suddenly withdrew from them (Mark xvi. 12; Luke xxiv. 13–31; *cf.* John xx. 14–18)—what does all this prove? Just nothing in regard to this matter. During his ministry he was accustomed to come and go in a sudden manner—sometimes by miraculous means—but did this argue that he assumed a spiritual, glorified body—or one having "some degree of glorification"—whatever that means? Away with all such Docetic, mythical fancies! Christ took special pains to show his disciples that his body was the very same which was wounded on the cross and laid in the tomb. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them." (Luke xxiv. 39–43.) It is absurd to rank this with epiphanies of angels appearing to the beholders like men, etc. In the case of our Lord there is absolute personal bodily identity. The resurrection body of Christ was identically the same which was laid in the grave, as it was informed by the same spirit which dwelt in it before his death, and which was restored to it at his resurrection—and both constituted as before the shrine of the same divinity which was united to the humanity in the Virgin's womb.

§ 4. The Catholic Doctrine.

We therefore strenuously contend for the Catholic doctrine as

set forth in our third article against all mythical and Docetic notions concerning the resurrection body of our blessed Lord. Ephraem the Syrian, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, and others of the Eastern Church, agreed with the theologians of the Western Church, that, as Jerome expresses it, Christ possessed the very same body before and after his resurrection. Its glorification did not begin till his ascension—when from a

psychical it was changed into a pneumatic body—retaining its essential identity, so that it is still a material vehicle for his soul and the shrine of his divinity—etherealized, sublimated, refined from all the grossness of flesh and bones and blood, yet so retaining its identity that no other body could take its place—no other be the proper temple for his soul and divinity—and no other could display such a form and features as will forever distinguish it from every other glorified body, so that what the poet says of the glorified soul may be said too of the glorified body which it informs:

> Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside,
> And I shall know him when we meet.

Thus, making due allowance for the bold realism of poetry, we may sing with Charles Wesley:

> The dear tokens of his passion
> Still his dazzling body bears.
> Cause of highest exultation
> To his ransomed worshipers.
> With what rapture
> Gaze we on these glorious scars!

Dr. Knapp well says:

> As inhabitants of earth, men have a mortal body, like Adam; as inhabitants of heaven, a refined and immortal body, like Christ, the second Adam. Christ, however, did not receive this body immediately on his resurrection; but when he became an inhabitant of heaven. During the forty days which succeeded his resurrection he ate and drank with his disciples—actions which cannot be predicated of heavenly bodies. He bore too on his body the scars and marks of the crucifixion. *Some few have supposed that he then* possessed a spiritual body, from a misunderstanding of the words θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, the doors being shut (John xx. 19–26).

Christ staid only forty days on earth after his resurrection, and

not all that time with his disciples, because he would give them no encouragement to think that (as they fondly desired) he was going to set up an earthly kingdom. (John xx. 17; Acts i. 6–11.) But he did not instantly ascend after his resurrection, as he wished to "show himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs" (Acts i. 1–5), so that there might be no doubt that he "did truly rise again from the dead."

Chapter II. Certainty of Christ's Resurrection.[1]

§ 1. Introductory.

308

With an approximation to certainty, the date of the redemption of mankind by the death of the Son of God may be fixed as Friday, March the eighteenth (the fourteenth of Nisan), A.D. 29: the year of the founding of the city of Rome, 782. Jesus expired at about three o'clock in the afternoon, thick darkness concealing the sun at noonday and continuing over the whole land until his death. (Matt. xxvii. 45–50; Mark. xv. 33–37; Luke xxiii. 44–46.) That same afternoon, the soldiers having the crucifixion in charge, upon inspection, are satisfied of his death; one of their number, however, puts Christ's dissolution beyond the possibility of doubt by wantonly thrusting his spear into the side of the dead man, piercing the pericardium, out of which flowed water and blood. John, an eye-witness, is careful to record these minute but all-important facts: the wickedness of that nameless Roman soldier, whose brutality shocks our sensibilities, was overruled for good, no less than the treachery of Judas and the cowardice of Pilate. (John xix. 33–35.) Upon the requisition of Pilate, the centurion commanding the soldiers certifies the governor that the sentence of execution has been carried into effect, and that the prisoner is dead: this fact, so important a link in the chain of evidence which establishes indisputably the death of the Saviour, Mark, whose narrative is ordinarily so brief, does not neglect to give a place in his account of the crucifixion. (Mark xv. 44–45.) His death being

309

established to the satisfaction of the officers of the law, then it is that the body is delivered to Joseph of Arimathea, and through Friday night, Saturday, the nineteenth of March, and Saturday night, the Prince of Life sleeps the sleep of death in Joseph's new tomb. Sunday morning, the twentieth, the tomb is found empty, and that first Easter Sunday is celebrated by no less than five of the ten appearances of the Risen Redeemer, henceforth, indeed, the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς, the "Prince of Life," over whom death no more

has dominion. From that day till the present universal Christendom has observed the feast of the resurrection, and this monumental festival stands as no mean witness against the Humes, the Strausses, and the Renans.

The presumptions, proofs, and demonstrations of the resurrection are to-day as clear, satisfactory, and cogent as they ever were. They cannot be affected by the lapse of time. It is an insinuating but transparent fallacy, by which men suffer themselves to drift into the belief—or rather prejudice—that the more remote the events the less credible is the testimony by which they are established. If there are contemporaneous records, and if those records are transmitted in their integrity, transactions of the time of Moses or of Christ will be as credible to the last generation living before the judgment as to the peoples in whose times and lands they occurred. Written records are the only instruments by which human knowledge can be endowed with an immortality which shall survive the successive extinctions of generations; and, unless it is unreasonably demanded of God that he should work some sort of perpetual miracle, it is obviously impossible that the facts of the gospel history could have become the heritage of all succeeding ages in any other way. If these gospel histories stand the test of the application of the ordinary canons of documentary and historical criticism, no more can be demanded. The assaults of skepticism, honest and willful,[2] have, year by year, more and more

vindicated their antiquity, genuineness, and authenticity, though, it must be borne in mind, these are questions which systematic theology does not feel called upon to raise and settle in connection with the history of Christ's resurrection any more than when other facts and truths of revelation are under consideration: from other departments of theological investigation these results are accepted. The vulgar rationalism which regarded the gospels as clumsy forgeries, and Jesus Christ as an unhistorical personage, or, at best, as either a silly or a wicked impostor, is a thing of the past. When a too ardent admirer of the great German philosopher brought into comparison the names of Kant and Jesus, Kant quickly replied: "The one name is holy; the other is that of a poor bungler doing his best to interpret him." Men of the most various characters, endowments, and pursuits—like Hegel, Spinoza, Napoleon, and even Voltaire and Rousseau—bring their testimonies to his superlative excellence of

character and greatness of achievement. “He is,” says Strauss, “the being without whose presence in the mind perfect piety is impossible.” “His beauty is eternal,” deposes Renan, “his reign will never end.” John Stuart Mill said of him that “he was a man charged with a special, express, unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue.”

It is admitted that the wonderful Nazarene peasant was a being of unsurpassed wisdom and virtue, and that he was cruelly and barbarously murdered. Did he rise again from the dead? This is the question we have now to consider and answer.

§ 2. The Pregnant Presumptions.

All the presumptions are directly opposed to the “myth” theory. It was neither an age nor a country for the production and growth of myths.[3] We have seen with what historical precision

the date of Christ’s death can be determined. Not in the remote, unhistorical period of the kings of Rome, nor yet in the republican age, but in the early imperial times, did Jesus Christ appear among men. He was born in the reign of Augustus, the first, and crucified in the reign of Tiberius, the second Roman Emperor. The same Gospels which inform us of his wisdom and virtue record also his miracles and prophecies—and these things were not done in a corner. In particular they tell us that he repeatedly predicted his own death and resurrection, events also clearly foretold in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is commonly admitted that Jesus died precisely as he predicted: the time, place, manner, and agents of his execution were all accurately and minutely prognosticated. The exact fulfillment of the predictions of his death should beget a strong presumption in favor of his resurrection on the third day, likewise predicted. Accordingly, the third day, by the consent of many competent witnesses, both enemies and friends, the tomb was vacant. This tomb was a new one, excavated in the solid rock, with but one mode of entrance or exit, and that closed with a great stone, which had been rolled to the mouth of the sepulcher, securely fastened and carefully sealed, and, at the time when the corpse certainly disappeared, was vigilantly guarded by a band of Roman soldiers acting under express orders from the governor.

Sleep on duty was sure death to a Roman sentinel. Could the few feeble,

dispirited, unarmed disciples muster the courage either to attack or to attempt the circumvention of this guard? What disposition could they have made of the body after by force or fraud they had secured it? What motive could they have had for the deed? Christ had indeed disappointed all their hopes. They may have betrayed, denied, and forsaken him, but they had neither the courage nor the folly to steal his body. The presumptions are strong that he rose from the dead as he and the prophets had predicted. Upon these presumptions Saurin offers the following commentary:

> If the body of Jesus Christ were not raised from the dead, it must have been stolen away. But this theft is incredible. Who committed it? The enemies of Jesus Christ? Would they have contributed to his glory by countenancing a report of his resurrection? Would his disciples? It is probable they would not, and it is next to certain they could not. How could they have undertaken to remove the body—frail and timorous creatures, people who fled as soon as they saw him taken into custody? Even Peter, the most courageous, trembled at the voice of a servant girl, and three times denied that he knew him. Would people of this character have dared to resist the authority of the governor? Would they have undertaken to oppose the determination of the Sanhedrim, to force a guard, and to elude or overcome soldiers armed and aware of danger? If Jesus Christ was not risen again (I speak the language of unbelievers), he had deceived his disciples with vain hopes of his resurrection. How came the disciples not to discover the imposture? Would they have hazarded themselves by undertaking an enterprise so perilous in favor of a man who had so cruelly imposed on their credulity? But were we to grant that they formed the design of removing the body, how could they have executed it? How could soldiers, armed and on guard, suffer themselves to be overreached by a few timorous people? Either (says St. Augustin) they were asleep or awake; if they were awake, why should they suffer the body to be taken away? If asleep, how could they know that the disciples took it away? How dare they then depose that it was stolen?

§ 3. The Infallible Proofs.

"He showed himself after his passion," says St. Luke, "by many *infallible proofs*, being seen of them forty days." (Acts i. 3.) There were in all ten distinct recorded appearances of the Risen Lord: (1)

to Mary Magdalene (John xx. 17); (2) to another company of women, by whom he was most familiarly known (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10); (3) to Simon Peter (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5); (4) to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 13–32); (5) to the ten apostles, Thomas being absent (John xx. 19–24). These five appearances occurred on the first Easter Sunday: the first FIRST-DAY of Christian worship. When

the disciples told Thomas, "We have seen the Lord," the doubter promptly replied, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." (John xx. 25.) These were hardly the mental conditions under which "subjective visions" are evolved; and it is one of the most singular and striking characteristics of the narratives of the resurrection in the several Gospels, that some part of the recorded testimony is specially adapted to meet some one of the several forms and theories of modern unbelief. So rich and varied is the Book itself, that we need not travel beyond its limits to refute the most recent and the most ingenious objections to it. A week later (6) Jesus visited the assembled eleven and challenged Thomas's skepticism, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing." (John xx. 27.) Thomas was permitted to doubt that we might have none; but upon these the Master himself pronounces a special blessing, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John xx. 29). (7) The Redeemer appeared again to the seven apostles by the Sea of Galilee (John xxi. 1–24); (8) he afterwards fulfilled an engagement on a mountain in Galilee and appeared to more than five hundred at once (Matt. xxviii. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 6); (9) he made a special visit to James, "the Lord's brother" (1 Cor. xv. 7); (10) finally, he led them out as far as to Bethany, and, while he blessed them, was parted from them, and carried up into heaven (Luke xxiv. 50, 51). These witnesses were chosen before of God for this very purpose. He appeared to those who knew him well, and not to promiscuous crowds. "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." (Acts x. 40, 41.) "The witnesses were in fact," says

Dr. Pope, “all the members of the Lord’s discipleship: expanding in number from the solitary Mary Magdalene to the five hundred. But they [the apostles] were chosen in the sense that special demonstration of the reality and of the nature of his risen body was given to the apostolic company. . . . He took more than one opportunity of showing the marks, τεκμηρία, of his hands and his feet, and of exhibiting the verity of his

body: even eating and drinking with his disciples.”[4] Concerning these witnesses and their testimony, McClintock and Strong (Art. “Resurrection of Christ”) with great terseness and vigor summarize the following points:

There are eight considerations which give the evidence sufficient weight.

1. The nature of these witnesses. They were not men of power, riches, eloquence, credit, to impose upon the world; they were poor and mean.
2. The number of these witnesses. It is not likely that a collusion should have been held among so many to support a lie, which would be of no utility to them.
3. The facts themselves which they avow: not suppositions, distant events, or events related by others, but real facts which they saw with their own eyes (1 John i.).
4. The agreement of their evidence: they all deposed the same thing.
5. Observe the tribunals before which they gave evidence: Jews and heathens, philosophers and rabbins, courtiers and lawyers. If they had been impostors, the fraud certainly would have been discovered.
6. The place in which they bore their testimony: not at a distance, where they might not easily have been detected, if false; but at Jerusalem, in the synagogues, in the pretorium.
7. The time of this testimony: not years after, but three days after, they declared he was risen; yea, before the rage of the Jews was quelled, while Calvary was yet dyed with the blood they had spilled. If it had been a fraud, it is not likely they would have come forward in such broad daylight, amid so much opposition.
8. Lastly, the motives which induced them to publish the resurrection: not to gain fame, riches, glory, profit; no, they exposed themselves to suffering and death, and proclaimed the truth from conviction of its importance and certainty.

The records were made at the time of the occurrence of the events, and imposture is excluded. Everywhere in the Acts and the

Epistles we see that from the beginning the theme of apostolic preaching and teaching was “Jesus and the Resurrection.” There is no appearance of fanaticism. There are no writings so simple, consistent, majestic, and self-evidencing of their truth as the Christian Scriptures. This testimony was borne against the violent opposition of all the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the times, as well as against popular rage and malice, and yet it was borne consistently, persistently, and triumphantly. In Jerusalem itself, where the crucifixion took place, the apostles speedily revolutionized public opinion, paralyzing the tribunals before which they were arraigned, and compelling their judges to substitute empty threats for judicial penalties. “When they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people.” (Acts iv. 21.) “It may be safely asserted,” concludes Dr. Charles Hodge,

315

“that the resurrection of Christ is at once the most important, and the best authenticated fact in the history of the world.”

§ 4. The Overwhelming Demonstrations.

For a lucid and sufficiently full, yet compact, exhibition of these demonstrations, we may accept the treatment of Dr. Pope:

The supreme witness of the resurrection of Christ was the Holy Ghost. To his evidence our Lord referred before he departed. (1) The Spirit accompanied the testimony of the apostles; (2) he has made the Christian Church the abiding demonstration of the life of its Head; and (3) he gives his assurance in the hearts of all to whose penitent faith he reveals the ascended Saviour.

(1) The apostles preached the Lord’s resurrection as witnesses who were sustained by the Spirit’s higher testimony: literally, a witness through, and in, and with their preaching. “And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.” (Acts v. 32.) While St. Peter preached the Risen Jesus to Cornelius, “the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word.” (Acts x. 44.) This was the reason that “with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.” (Acts iv. 33.) It was because they declared it with the confidence of personal assurance, “God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will,” (Heb. ii. 4.)

(2) The history of the Christian Church, with its institutions, is one continuous and ever-enlarging demonstration of the unseen life of its Ruler. The Lord's-day, which has been kept as the memorial of the resurrection from its very morning, is itself testimony that there was never a time when the clear faith in that vital fact was not held. Similarly, the Eucharistic celebration has from the beginning avowed reliance on a Death once suffered and in a Life which has not been continued upon earth. From the Day of Pentecost the Church has been opposed by principalities and powers, human and superhuman; but never has the resurrection of its Head and Defender been successfully assailed.

(3) The most universal and best evidence is the influence of the unseen Redeemer by his Spirit in the hearts and lives of believers. The later New Testament dwells on the working in us of the "mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead." (Eph. i. 19, 20.) The spiritual life of those who accept the Saviour is to themselves a ground of assurance that needs nothing to be added. They receive the records because they are bound up with the Scriptures of truth; they believe the event recorded because it took place in harmony with ancient prediction, according to the Lord's own word, and in consistency with his own divine power. They know that no argument was brought against the fact by those who were most interested in denying it in the beginning; and that no argument has been brought since that has any force. But their infallible evidence is the life of their own souls.[5]

To this convincing presentation of the overwhelming demonstrations of the truth of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus may

be added Dr. Charles Hodge's masterly analysis and summary of the argument:

1. It was predicted in the Old Testament.
2. It was foretold by Christ himself.
3. It was a fact admitting of easy verification.
4. Abundant, suitable, and frequently repeated evidence was afforded of its actual occurrence.
5. The witnesses to the fact that Christ was seen alive after his death upon the cross were numerous, competent, and on every account worthy of confidence.
6. Their sincerity of conviction was proved by the sacrifices, even that of life, which their testimony entailed upon them.
7. Their testimony was confirmed by God bearing witness together with them *σ*υνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. ii. 4), in signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost.
8. The testimony of the Spirit is continued to the present time and

granted to all the true children of God, for the Spirit bears witness to the truth in the heart and conscience.

9. The fact of Christ's resurrection has been commemorated by a religious observance of the first day of the week from its occurrence to the present time.
10. The effects produced by his gospel, and the change which it has effected in the state of the world, admit of no other rational solution than the truth of his death and subsequent resurrection. The Christian Church is his monument. All believers are his witnesses.[6]

§ 5. Importance of the Doctrine.

1. The resurrection confirms the divinity of the Saviour's mission.
2. It guarantees the divine placability, inasmuch as it demonstrates that the Father has accepted the atonement made by his Son.
3. It introduces Messiah to his mediatorial life in heaven, in which we have so great an interest. His intercession is the complement of his sacrifice.
4. It constitutes the expressive symbol and sure basis of our spiritual resurrection from the death of sin. As death has no more dominion over him, so sin shall not have dominion over us. (Rom. vi. 9, 14.)
5. It is at once the proof, pledge, and model of our resurrection from the dead at the last day. Christ was the first-fruits of a mighty harvest. (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23.)[7]

---

1. At this point there is an hiatus of considerable extent in Dr. Summers's MS. He was doubtless in the habit of reading to his classes an Easter article or sermon, printed in the *Christian Advocate* or elsewhere, and, in its printed form, of convenient reference and use. This I have been unable to find, and, in lieu thereof, have constructed an independent chapter, following the outline contained in my lecture-notes, made while a member of the Doctor's class, but gathering most of the material from other sources. The writer alone must be held responsible for both the substance and the form.—T. ↩
2. In Johnson's Cyclopedia, Art. "Resurrection of Christ," are

enumerated no less than eleven hypotheses by which unbelievers have sought to explain away this great foundation fact of Christianity. It has been maintained (1) that Christ's body was stolen; (2) that he was resuscitated from a swoon; (3) that the belief in the resurrection arose from subjective visions; (4) that the belief grew up as a myth; (5) that it was a self-generated delusion arising from the determination of the disciples not to be disappointed in their hopes and projects; (6) that the whole affair was a tale devised to meet the prejudices of the Jews, who could not be persuaded to recognize their Messiah in a crucified malefactor; (7) that it was a conscious imposture; (8) that it is an allegory of the soul after death; (9) that it is an allegory of the regeneration of society; (10) that it is an allegory of the rising of souls from the death of sin; and (11) that it is an allegory of the rising of souls from *Hades* to judgment.↩

3. "But we have also another question to ask," says Bishop Martensen ("Christian Dogmatics," pp. 253, 254), "Is it conceivable that the age in which Christ appeared should have produced a mythology? Our answer is, No! That age was an age of culture, an age of intellect, an age of unbelief and doubt. *Intentional* religious fictions may indeed be issued in such an age; in point of fact writings of this character were promulgated by the leaders of individual sects. Fantastic and senseless superstitions, such as are commonly found accompanying an age of unbelief, may have made their appearance in that day. Anecdotes and particular traits of a mythical character, such as are accustomed to gather around great historical persons and events, and to constitute as it were a border to realities, may then spring up; but the creation of a world of myths is impossible in such an age. Myths proper only arise where the human mind still occupies the stage of nature; where the world of imagination has not yet been clearly and consciously distinguished from the world of reality. Only in its childhood is the human race capable of dreaming mythical dreams like those we find in the mythologies of Greece and the North; in an age whose predominant characteristic is *skepticism* it is impossible for it to cherish such *naive* faith in its own dreams of the 'reconciliation of the ideal and the real.' On the contrary, it is one of the most marked features of the age to give prominence to the contradiction between the ideal and the real; and it totally lacks the inner force requisite to the creation of a world of dreams, full of life and spirit. . . . Here, therefore, in asking us to conceive of Christ as a creation of the Church, instead of regarding the Church as a creation of Christ, as the temple built of living stones, Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone, these critics have again offended against the '*principium rationis sufficientis*.'"↩
4. "Compendium," etc., Vol. II., pp. 174, 175.↩

5. “Compendium,” etc., Vol. II., pp. 177, 178.↩
6. “Systematic Theology,” Vol. II., pp. 626, 627.↩
7. Since the publication of the first edition of this work, I have discovered Dr. Summers’s own treatment of the subject of this chapter. The reader desirous of seeing Dr. Summers’s exact statement on this important and, with him, favorite theme, will find it cited as a specimen of his style in Dr. Fitzgerald’s “Life,” pp. 216–225.—T.↩

Chapter III. The Ascension and Session of Christ.

§ 1. The Ascension.

317

What importance is to be attached to the ascension of Christ? We should judge that, as a fact and a doctrine, it is very important, inasmuch as it is so frequently alluded to in the New Testament, as it was "represented typically, and declared prophetically," in the Old Testament. See Lev. xvi. with Heb. ix.; Ps. lxviii. with Eph. iv. It is also explicitly stated in the three Creeds, and in the Catechism and Hymnal.

The Ascension here alluded to is not of his divinity, nor of his soul after death and before his resurrection, but it is the local translation of his body and soul from earth to the highest heaven. We say "the highest heaven"—for he "passed through the heavens," as is the original in Heb. iv. 14. He is made "higher than the heavens." (Heb. vii. 26.) "He descended to the lower parts of the earth"—that is, to this low earth—and the same is he "that ascended up far above all heavens." (Eph. iv. 10.) He went up to "the third heaven, where God resides." Without foundation is the notion of the Seleuciani, Hermiani, and Manicheans, that the body of Christ was deposited in the sun. Mark says, "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." (Mark xvi. 19.) Luke says, "He led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." (Luke xxiv. 50, 51.) So, with more detail, Luke describes the Ascension in Acts i., where "the mount called Olivet" is designated as the place from which he ascended. The traditional site is on the brow of Olivet. This does not contradict Luke xxiv., because Bethany there means the district which reaches to the top, where it joins Bethphage, and not the town, which is about a mile farther, on the eastern slope. No unprejudiced person can read the account in Acts i. without

318

seeing that it was a real local translation of the entire humanity of

Christ to heaven. The disciples saw him ascend. “They looked steadfastly toward heaven, *as he went up.*” This word is used of his death (Luke xxii. 22), and of his ascension (John xiv. 2, 3), where it is translated “go.” This “was his journey to the skies.” No wonder the disciples gazed on their ascending Lord: so Elisha gazed on Elijah when he traveled the same route in a chariot of fire. The disciples saw the chariot of cloud, but they did not see the myriads of angels that drew it and attended it. They could not with their bodily eyes witness the change by which his “body of flesh and bones” was changed into a spiritual, glorified body. (Phil. iii. 20, 21.) They doubtless strained their eyes, and saw the splendid object for many a mile, but finally it went beyond their vision, and their beloved Master was taken from their head. They wondered at it; but after the pentecostal baptism they saw how “expedient” it was, as their Lord had told them. (John xvi.) Without the ascension of Jesus there had been no descent of the Holy Spirit, no advocacy of our interest before the throne, no preparing of a place for us, no such powerful attraction as we need to draw us upward.

His ascension is the complement of his resurrection. He rose from the dead to attest the acceptance of his atoning sacrifice; but, far more than that, he rose in order to ascend. “Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.” (Rom. vi. 9.) Hence the resurrection and ascension are so closely blended together: “God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power . . . and hath put all things under his feet.” (Eph. i. 20–22.) Peter speaks of “the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.” (1 Pet. iii. 21, 22.) Hence he staid upon the earth only forty days after his resurrection—just long enough to demonstrate the reality of his resurrection, and to give final instructions to his disciples, and no longer—for, as he told Mary, he did not rise from the tomb to stay upon the earth, but to ascend into heaven. (John xx. 17.)

§ 2. Intercession and Session.

His ascension was the necessary preliminary of his intercession. He is to appear forever in the presence of God for us.

There he shows "the clear tokens of his passion"—there he makes perpetual intercession for us. He is our "*Paraclete* with the Father" (1 John ii. 1); and in that capacity he prays the Father to send us that "other *Paraclete*, to abide with us forever." (John xiv. 15–17; xvi. 7.) It was the preliminary too of his mediatorial reign. He could not reign personally, corporeally, upon the earth, at Jerusalem or anywhere else, during, before, or after the millennium. He is seated on the throne, "on the right hand of the Majesty on high." (Heb. i. 3.) "Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. cx. 1.) Thus poor sinners upon the earth know whither to send their prayers and their complaints.

He ever lives to intercede
Before his Father's face!
Give him, my soul, thy cause to plead,
Nor doubt the Father's grace.

His ascension and session at the right hand of God, when fully believed, cannot but draw our souls upward. He is the cynosure of all in heaven who see him as he is, and of all on earth who see him by faith. Being risen with Christ, we ascend with him by faith and hope and love. (Col. iii. 1–4.) We cannot really believe that Christ has ascended up on high, without thus following Christ our Head to heaven.

See, he lifts his hands above!
See, he shows the prints of love!
Hark, his precious lips bestow
Blessings on his Church below!
Ever upward let us move,
Wafted on the wings of love;
Looking when thou, Lord, shalt come.
Longing, gasping after home.

This suggests too that his ascension and session are a guaranty of his second advent. He is our Forerunner—he is gone to prepare a place for us. "And," says he, "if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." (John xiv. 1–3.) So the angels told the disciples at the time of the Ascension: "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him

go into heaven." (Acts i. 11; *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.)

His ascension, as it is a guaranty of his second coming, so it is

320

an assurance of our ascension with him. That is the grand design of his coming, to raise us from the tomb, and to take us body and soul with him to heaven. He will bring our "triumphant spirits" with him, that they may put on their glorified bodies—and we, like him, shall find the complement of our resurrection in our ascension with him to heaven; "and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Our eyes look upward to the hills
Whence our returning Lord shall come:
We wait thy chariot's awful wheels,
To fetch our longing spirits home.

But not without our bodies. They "shall be changed, and made like unto his glorious body," which furnishes the model of our bodies, as his ascension gives the assurance of our ascension. As the Head is risen and ascended, we may be sure the members shall in due time arise and ascend with their exalted Head.

§ 3. Dr. Pope on Our Lord's Session.

[The sequel of the Ascension is the Session at the right hand of God in heaven; with its attestation on earth, the pentecostal descent of the Holy Spirit, the promise of the New Covenant.

1. The Session was the subject of our Saviour's prophecy, equally with the events that preceded it. His first reference to it was indirect: "He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" (Matt. xxii. 43, 44.) Afterward, in his own day of judgment, when he was adjured by the high-priest and confessed himself the Son of God, he varied the phrase: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power." (Matt. xxvi. 64.) This emphatic twofold allusion of Christ is echoed throughout the New Testament, and rules all that follows.

    1. The Apostle Peter speaks of him as raised "by the right hand of God" (Acts ii. 33) to sit "on the right hand of God" (1 Pet. iii. 22). And he constantly refers to the Session, sometimes with and sometimes without the term, to express the

mediatorial authority of Christ as an administration of the power of God: to shed forth the influences of that Holy Ghost who represents upon earth the Lord's administration in heaven. But St. Paul is the elect expositor of this authority, and he sums up the entire doctrine in his Ephesian epistle: "He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." (Eph. i. 20, 22, 23.)

2. Hence the Ascension is described as the beginning of a supreme authority which is to end when he "hath put all enemies under his feet." (1 Cor. xv. 25.)

   321

   Until then our Lord's Session is passive also, as in the attitude of expectation: "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." (Heb. x. 12, 13.) But Stephen, for his assurance in death, saw "the Son of man *standing* on the right hand of God." (Acts vii. 56.)

3. But lastly, this delegated and terminable authority is based upon an eternal prerogative of session: He who sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high was the Son, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;" before his incarnation "being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power." (Heb. i. 2, 3.) Nor could he have sat on the right hand of God, in universal supremacy, had he not in his eternal dignity been "in the bosom of the Father." (John i. 18.)

2. The Pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost was at once the immediate proof of the verity of the ascension, and the demonstration of the authority to which it led. The prediction of the Psalmist, "Thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them" (Ps. lxviii. 18), was interpreted both by our Lord and by St. Paul of the supreme gift of the Spirit. "I will send him unto you" (John xvi. 7) was the promise before the Saviour's departure; it was confirmed after his resurrection; and it was fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost once for all and forever.

   1. For this there were ten days of preparation. . . . Evidently

their Master's purpose was to make this interval a period of discipline: without his personal presence in the flesh, and without his spiritual manifestation by the Holy Ghost, they were reduced for a season to a midway condition of which there is no parallel. But these days were days of prayer; of personal and united preparation for the most glorious revelation heaven had ever sent down to earth. The circle of the apostolic company was made complete by the choice of Matthias; and this by lot, as in an intermediate dispensation between the Lord's departure and the coming of the Spirit. Thus the organic body prepared for the Spirit by the Lord himself was made whole after the great breach that had been made in it. And the individual believers were prepared for the high Gift by meditation upon their own powerlessness and need, and by fervent prayer for its bestowment. . . .

2. The Gift itself was the demonstration of the Session of Christ at the right hand of God. "Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii. 33.) St. Paul speaks of the ascension-gifts unto men with special reference to the dispensation of the ministry for the edifying of the body of Christ, which began with the Day of Pentecost. (Eph. iv. 8, 12.) But the great prophecy in the psalm, that "the Lord God might dwell among them," had its plenary fulfillment when the Holy Ghost came down as the Shekinah, the symbol of God manifest in the flesh, resting upon the Church and abiding within it as the indwelling presence of the Holy Trinity.1]

---

1. Pope, "Compendium," etc., Vol. II., pp. 181–183.↩

Chapter IV. Return of Christ to Judgment.

§ 1. Statement of the Doctrine.

322

The article states that Christ will sit in heaven "until he return to judge all men at the last day."

It is remarkable that Bishop Burnet dismisses this important subject in one paragraph of about a dozen lines, and Bishop Browne gives it only four pages; whereas it is a distinct article in the Apostles' Creed—Article VII.: "From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead"—as in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan and Athanasian Creeds, and in the *Te Deum*: "We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge." Bishop Pearson very properly elaborates it in more than twenty images.

§ 2. The Second Advent of Christ.

The explicitness of this article concerning the Second Advent of Christ to judge the world, may account for the omission of the article, in the Forty-two Articles, denouncing the heresy of the millenarians, who held that Christ will descend corporeally and reign on the earth for a thousand years before he comes to judgment. This article properly asserts that he shall return from heaven, where he is seated at the right hand of God, to judge the world.

So in the Collect for the first Sunday in Advent: "That in the last day when he shall come again, in his glorious majesty, to judge both the quick and the dead, we may rise to the life immortal." So in the Collect for the third Sunday in Advent: "That at thy second coming to judge the world we may be found an acceptable people in thy sight." His session at the right hand of the Father continues till his second coming to close his mediatorial work in raising the dead and judging the world.

As there is nothing explicit concerning the general resurrection in the Confession, it may be inferred that it is implicitly contained

in this article, as the resurrection of Christ is viewed as

the proof and pledge of our resurrection, which is necessary in order to our appearing before the judgment-seat of Christ. Then when he shall return from heaven to earth to raise the dead he will judge all men; and this is here said to be at the last day.

§ 3. Why Christ is the Judge.

There is no place for the rabbinical figment that there are two Messiahs—one the son of Joseph, a suffering Messiah, and the other the son of David, a triumphant Messiah. "This same Jesus," who first came to visit us in great humility, and whom the disciples saw "taken up into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11.); only when he shall "come again" it will be "in his glorious majesty to judge the quick and the dead." Who so proper to be the judge? God indeed is said to be "the judge of all the earth" (Gen. xviii. 25); and so the day of judgment is called "the day of God" (2 Pet. iii. 12), which may be referred to the Father, or to "the whole Trinity;" but as God made all worlds by the Son, so he will judge all worlds by him. Especially is this so in reference to this world which he has redeemed.

This will be his last mediatorial act. He says himself, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son" "and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." (John v. 22, 27.) "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31.) "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of all men by Jesus Christ." (Rom. ii. 16; *cf.* Acts x. 42.) "God is judge himself" (Ps. i. 6); but then Christ is God; he is also man, and he exercises the functions of a judge in his theanthropic character. Hence the judgment is called "the day of Christ." (Phil. ii. 16.)

He could no more judge the world than he could create it, if he were not God as well as man, as it requires the incommunicable attributes of Deity for both undertakings. But it is obviously proper that the judge of all men should be man as well as God, in view of

the fact that God had to become man, or assume humanity, in order to redeem men—an economy restricted to our world.

The congruity of this is seen in the reward of glory which is

thus accorded to the incarnate God, who was adjudged to death by men. (Matt. xxvii. 23.)

> Power and dominion are his due
> Who stood condemned at Pilate's bar.

In his deepest humiliation he said: "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man, sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." (Matt. xxvi. 64.)

Dr. Knapp says: "God has constituted him the judge of all men, because he is man, and knows from his own experience all the sufferings and infirmities to which our nature is exposed, and can therefore be compassionate and indulgent. (Heb. ii. 14–17; *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 5.)"

At all events, this economy "suits the sinner best."

Bishop Pearson says: "If we look upon ourselves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before rather than him who is of the same nature with us? But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, Christ, who is both God and man, is appointed judge; so as he is man, all shall see him, and as he is God, they only shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him."

§ 4. Certainty of the Judgment.

This has been argued from the justice of God; for as there is an unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life, there must be a judgment to come, and a future retribution in which all shall be rewarded or punished according to their deserts, and God shall justify his ways to men. Besides, the testimony of conscience warrants the expectation of the final judgment.

Arguments of this sort favor the belief of a judgment to come, yet they afford no certainty of it. But the Bible abounds with declarations which render it absolutely certain. Nothing, indeed, is more clearly revealed. "For God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it

be evil." (Eccl. xii. 14.) "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he shall judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31; *cf.* Matt. xii. 36, 37; xxv. 31–46; John v. 26–29; Acts xxiv. 25; Rom. ii. 1–16; xiv. 9–12; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Thess. i. 5–10; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Rev. xx. 11–15.)

325

From these unequivocal testimonies it is evident that a man should reject the Holy Scriptures rather than profess to believe them, and yet deny the certainty of future judgment.

§ 5. Universality of the Judgment.

The article says Christ shall "return to judge all men at the last day." There is a sense in which he shall judge angels and devils as well as men. They were all alike created by him, and are all governed by him; and it is congruous and right that they all should be judged by him.

Angels—good angels—stand related in many ways to men; and though not redeemed by Christ, yet they share in many of the blessings which flow from redemption, and do much to promote its grand issues; and it seems right and proper that all this should be made known in the day of judgment, when they will receive their final reward for their fidelity and beneficent service, and be confirmed, like the saints, in their inheritance of purity and bliss.

So with the devils—Satan and his angels—who stand so intimately and causatively related to the sin of the world, and who are accountable for their own personal prevarication: it seems proper and right that they should receive their final award of punishment at the same time that the unhappy victims of their malice shall be adjudged to theirs. This appears to be set forth in Matt. viii. 29; xxv. 41; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.

The following language, therefore, in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, seems to be unguarded: "As for the concern of others in the judgment, angels will be no otherwise concerned than as attendants, gathering the elect, raising the dead, etc.; but not as advising or judging. Saints are said to judge the world, not as co-judges with Christ, but as approvers of his sentence, and as their

holy lives and exhortations will rise up in judgment against their wicked neighbors." (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.)

But the saints will "judge angels" too, as they will applaud the favorable sentence pronounced upon the good angels for their fealty to their Sovereign, and their kind offices to his redeemed subjects on the earth, as well as the sentence of condemnation pronounced upon the wicked angels; and their fealty to their Sovereign will set forth in a clearer light the righteousness of

the sentence pronounced upon evil angels, as well as on evil men, for their rebellion.

Dr. Knapp says: "Christ will pronounce sentence upon *all* men, even on those who have lived in paganism. (Rom. ii. 6, *seq.* Acts xvii. 31.) Final sentence will then be pronounced upon the evil spirits. (Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Matt. xxv. 41.)"

§ 6. Publicity of the Judgment.

In a certain sense men are judged individually at their death, as their spirits are then consigned to heaven or hell.

Dr. Watts[1] says:

> I will not undertake to determine, when the soul is dismissed from the body, whether there be any explicit divine sentence passed concerning its eternal state of happiness or misery, according to its works in this life, or whether the pain or pleasure that belongs to the separate state be not chiefly such as arises, by natural consequence, from a life of sin or a life of holiness, and as being under the power of an approving or a condemning conscience; but it seems to me more probable that since the spirit returns to God that gave it (Eccl. xii. 7), to God the judge of all, with whom the spirits of the just made perfect dwell (Heb. xii. 23); and since the spirit of a Christian when absent from the body is present with the Lord—that is, Christ (2 Cor. v. 8)—I am more inclined to think that there is some sort of judicial determination of this important point, either by God himself, or by Jesus Christ, into whose hands he has committed all judgment (John v. 22). It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment (Heb. ix. 27); whether immediate or more distant is not here, expressly declared, though the immediate connection of the words hardly gives room for seventeen hundred years to intervene. But if the solemn formalities of a judgment be delayed, yet the conscience of a separate spirit reflecting on a holy or a sinful life is sufficient to begin a heaven or a hell immediately

after death.

Dr. Knapp distinguishes between a particular and the general judgment:

> Since now the destiny of man is decided immediately after death, and since such a decision is usually made by a *judgment* and *sentence*, there is no more proper way of representing this arrangement of God with respect to the future destiny of men than by comparing it with a judgment, since it has the same effect as a formal judgment. This has given occasion to the division of judgment into *particular*, or *preceding* (*judicium particulare*, or *antecedens*), which denotes nothing more than the determining of the fate of men immediately after death; and universal or subsequent (*judicium universale*, or *consequens*). It is respecting the former that Paul speaks, Heb. ix. 27, "It is appointed unto men once to die," "μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις"—*i. e.*, then follows the determination of their destiny, whether it shall be happy or miserable. *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 10. The Pharisees also, according to Josephus (Ant. xviii. 2), taught that the soul is immortal, and after death is *judged under the earth*, and rewarded or punished according to its works.

327

But the general judgment must be public. All, small and great, must stand before God. This is represented in Scripture under the metaphor of a grand assize. The Judge descends from heaven, attended by his apparitors, the chief of whom sounds the trumpet to summon all nations before the bar of the Judge; the judgment-seat, a great white throne, is set in full view of the universe; the books are opened, the good and evil deeds of all therein recorded are proclaimed, the sentence is pronounced, and all are rewarded or punished according to the deeds done in the body.

This judgment, "according to works," is not opposed to justification by faith: the latter takes place in this life, and consists in the pardon of sin, while the justification in the last day is a declaration that those upon whom the favorable sentence is pronounced have been "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." It is public, that all the universe may know who are approved and who are condemned; and the reason for the award in every case.

This shows the error of those who say there will be no general assize—all being fully rewarded or punished at death. "The quick and the dead" must all be judged by the Lord Jesus Christ "at his appearing and his kingdom." (2 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv. 13–18; Rev. xx. 11–15.)

If “the quick”—that is, those who shall be alive at the time of the second advent—shall *die*, as some think, they will not *sleep*—that is, remain for any time in the state of death; “but they shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” By *we* the apostle means those who shall be alive at the coming of Christ, as he explains it in 1 Thess. iv. 15–17: “We which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (precede) them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” That is, those then alive shall have no advantage over those who have been long dead. Abel and Noah shall fare as well as Enoch and Elijah, and those alive on

the earth must wait for their “perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul,” till the departed spirits of the saints shall regain their bodies, and then shall the living be changed, and all together, in soul and body, “shall his glorious image bear.”

§ 7. Impartiality of the Judgment.

It is called “the righteous judgment of God.” (Rom. ii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 5.) When about to suffer martyrdom, Paul said: “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.” (2 Tim. iv. 8.) The secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed. “For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.” (Eccl. xii. 14.) Millions of our thoughts, words, and deeds, recorded on the tablet of our memory, as well as in the book of God’s remembrance, but which have been overlaid and blurred and blotted, so that we and others have forgotten them, will come to light. As when the face of a monument is cleansed, and the rays of the sun are cast upon it, the inscription so long invisible comes to light; or, as when the proper agents are applied to a

palimpsest the hidden writing comes to view, and is readily deciphered; so when the books are opened, and the fires of the judgment flash their light upon them, every syllable there inscribed, and which was apparently obliterated, comes to view, and the whole record is read by an assembled universe.

The evil deeds of the good, though pardoned, will all be proclaimed, for though they are no longer remembered to be punished, because they have been forgiven for the sake of Christ, yet they cannot be forgotten: God forgets nothing, and it is doubtful whether in the absolute sense men or angels or devils can forget any thing they have ever known. The righteous will remember their past sins, and adore their Saviour for procuring their remission: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood"—"to him be glory." (Rev. i. 5, 6.) In their modesty and humility they are represented as not knowing the good deeds they had done; but their memory of these will be quickened by the Judge himself—as indeed is necessary to justify the public award which they shall receive.

And so of the evil deeds of the wicked: they forget many of

them in this life—they will remember them all in the day of judgment and through all eternity. "Son, remember," has an awful sound! Memory and conscience will beget remorse, and that will be the most bitter ingredient in the cup of the damned.

Dr. Knapp says: "This sentence will be righteous and impartial. (2 Tim. iv. 8.) Every one will be judged according to the light he has enjoyed, and the use he has made of it. Those who have had the written law will be judged according to that; the heathen, according to the light of nature. (Rom. ii. 13–16.) Those who have had greater knowledge and more opportunities and powers for doing good than others, and yet have neglected or abused them, will receive a severer sentence. (Matt. xi. 20–24; 2 Thess. i. 5.)"

§ 8. Finality of the Judgment.

The General Judgment closes this the last dispensation. The trumpet which summons all mankind before the dread tribunal is "the last trump." (1 Cor. xv. 52.) It takes place on "the last day." (John vi. 39, 40, 44.) It is "the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.)

Hence theologians speak of it as “the last judgment.” Dr. Young calls it

The day for which all other days were made.

The Scriptures give no hint as to the date of its occurrence, except that it will be at the end of time. “But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burnt up. Nevertheless, we according to his promise look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” (2 Pet. iii. 10, 13.)

This subject has been greatly beclouded by considering various passages of Scripture which refer to the close of the Jewish age, as eschatological—especially Mark xiii. 32: “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” But if none knew when the Jewish state was to end—that is, the precise day and hour—we may well infer that it was not one of the things which the Son was commissioned to reveal: of course, no one else knew any thing about it. Thousands have insanely attempted to determine the time of Christ’s second advent, and with worse than negative results. As Knapp says, “It is not according to the

mind of Christ, since it usually leads to the neglect of what is more important”—and he might have added, as it is prompted by fanaticism, so it frequently leads to infidelity or insanity. We know it will be at the end of time—when the mediatorial dispensation shall cease; for “then cometh the end.” (1 Cor. xv. 24.)

All other judgments will culminate in this. It is, indeed, a court of appeals for the universe, at which all righteous decisions of the courts below shall be confirmed, and all unrighteous decisions shall be reversed. From its decisions there can be no appeal. It is emphatically “the last judgment,” as no others succeed it; and “eternal judgment” (Heb. vi. 2), as its allotments are irrevocable; for according to the sentence then pronounced by “the Lord, the righteous judge,” “the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” (Matt. xxv. 46.)

Augustin says:

When we speak of the day of God’s judgment, we add the word last or

final, for this reason, because even now God judges, and has judged from the beginning of human history. In this book I shall speak not of those first judgments, nor of those intervening judgments of God, but of the last judgment, when Christ is to come from heaven to judge the quick and the dead. For that day is properly called the day of judgment, because in it there shall be no room left for the ignorant questioning why this wicked person is happy, and that righteous man is unhappy. In that day true and full happiness shall be the lot of none but the good, while deserved and supreme misery shall be the portion of the wicked, and of them only.[2]

§ 9. Its Awards.

The awards of the judgment will be eternal retribution administered to the righteous and the wicked, according to their works. In the Bible it is said there will be a separation between the righteous and the wicked on the day of judgment. (Matt. xiii.; xxv.; Rev. xx., *et al.*) They will be assigned to different abodes. The place and state of the righteous in the future world is usually called "Heaven;" the place and state of the wicked is usually called "Hell," though other terms are employed.

---

1. "Essay on a Separate State," Sec. 1.↩
2. There are profitable reflections on the day of judgment in á Kempis's "Imitation of Christ," Book I. Chap. 24. Of course the famous Judgment Hymn, *Dies Irae*, will not be overlooked.↩

Part II. Eschatology.

Chapter I. Death and the Dead.

§ 1. Phenomena of Death.

331
Death precedes the Judgment. Viewed in a scientific light, death is the total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions. It is thus distinguished from syncope, or any other form of suspended animation from which the patient may recover.

> But tell me, frighted nature, What is death?
> Blood only stopped, and interrupted breath?
> The utmost limit of a narrow span?
> And end of motion which with life began?

In the article of death, the senses cease their functions; the nerves of motion, as well as those of sensation, no longer maintain connection with the external world or with the brain, which forever ceases to act; the lungs no longer respire; the heart no longer beats; the blood stops; the muscles become rigid; the animal heat is extinguished.

> And like a clock worn out with eating time.
> The weary wheels of life at last stand still.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God, who gave it." Observation attests the former proposition; Scripture, the latter. (Eccl. xii. 7.)

§ 2. Solemnity of Death.

Nothing is more commonplace than death—nothing more solemn. Its solemnity arises from these considerations:

1. *It is certain*, as a fact. "The living know that they shall die."
2. *It is uncertain*, as to the time of its occurrence. "There is a time to die;" but when it will come no mortal knows. The determined suicide, the condemned prisoner may have his plan

frustrated, as in the case of Cowper, or his reprieve posted to him at the supreme moment. The schemes and purposes for longevity may be burst like bubbles in a moment. So uncertain is the time of our leaving this earthly scene.

3. *It is universal.* "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person." (2 Sam. xiv. 14.) "Death knocks alike at the rich man's palace and the poor man's gate."
4. *It is irreversible.* Two of our race, besides the representative of our race, "the Son of man," had the sentence reversed, so that though in a sense Enoch and Elijah may have died, and Christ certainly did die, yet the former in a moment, and the latter in a short time, were restored to bodily life and invested with immortality. We know of no other exceptions—unless we take into account those who shall be alive at the second Advent of Christ, and who shall "be changed," as were Enoch and Elijah. Those who were raised by miracle soon died again; their revivification was a miraculous event, designed to subserve special ends, in which is not included any communication concerning the mysteries of the other world, into which they were probably not initiated—the return to their earthly existence being, of course, previously known to the Lord, the Life-giver.

    Behold a man raised up by Christ!
    The rest remaineth unrevealed:
    He told it not; or something sealed
    The lips of that evangelist.

5. *It is penal.* "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "The body is dead because of sin." (Rom. v. 12; viii. 10.) "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (1 Cor. xv. 26.) Infants die, not as the young of the inferior animals die, by a law of nature; but because they belong to a sinning race. Neither Adam nor his descendants would have died but for sin. The glorious fact that the curse is transmuted into a blessing by the redemption of the second Adam, who has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light

through the gospel, does not disprove the point in question, but rather confirms it. If grim death has lost his sting, and wears an angel's face, it is only toward infants who have never personally sinned, and believers who have secured an interest in the inheritance

of eternal life beyond the grave, procured for them by Him who is the Conqueror of death, and who is the Resurrection and the Life. The scientist comparing the bodies of men with the bodies of inferior animals, and looking at the laws to which the former as well as the latter are subject, may infer that they were created alike mortal. But all that can be proved in this case is, that man was created with a contingent liability to die, but at the same time with the prerogative not to die—the conditions being articulately stated in Gen. ii., iii.: Obey God—eat of the tree of life—and live forever, the earthly paradisaical life in due time being exchanged, without dying, for the heavenly. Disobey God—eat of the forbidden tree—and die, the body being disintegrated as are the bodies of animals, and the soul being separated from God, which is spiritual death, and finally sentenced to perpetual banishment from God, which is eternal death. This would have been the result, and Adam's posterity would have died seminally in him, but for the intervention of the second Adam, as Paul tells us. (Rom. v.; 1 Cor. xv.) *Cf.* Wisdom ii. 23: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil, came death into the world."

§ 3. Separation of the Soul and the Body.

If death may not be scientifically defined as the separation of the soul from the body; yet this is implied in the last analysis. Assuming that man has a dual nature—a soul as well as a body—our common sense tells us that the partnership is dissolved in the article of death. With philosophical reasonings and speculations as to the *post-mortem* state of the soul we have here nothing to do.

§ 4. Disintegration and Reconstruction of the Body.

By observation we see that the *cadaver*—the body separated from the soul—is subjected to disintegration. It is so offensive that we have to bury our dead out of our sight, or dispose of them by embalming, cremation, or some other process.

The twelve or fourteen elements of which it is composed are disunited, there being no vital *vinculum* to keep them together, and they are blended with the oxygen, hydrogen, and other correspondent elements in the world around. What took place during life, in the partial and constant dissolution—in that case with

replacement of those elements—now takes place totally, without any replacement. With the exception of some mummies—in which, indeed, molecular changes have taken place—the millions of bodies which were animated like ours, and which for millenniums have been laid in the grave, are undistinguishable, as those of the inferior animals, or the vegetals that flourished for awhile and then perished forever.

Natural science, of course, testifies nothing *pro* or *con* as to the reconstruction of the body. Revelation assures us that there shall be a resurrection; and though it does not say in so many words, "a resurrection of the body" or "of the flesh," as in the old creeds, yet that is implied, as the soul needs no resurrection, never having fallen in the πτῶσις of death. It does not, however, settle the question as to the revivification of the identical corpuscles which were laid in the grave, but rather intimates the contrary, according to the analogy of our living bodies, which change their corpuscles continually, without destroying the identity of the bodies, which are thus in a constant flux—like a river, which retains its name, its size, windings, color, etc., though the drops of water of which it is constituted are changing every moment. It is enough that we shall have bodies, pneumatic ("spiritual") yet material shrines for our glorified spirits.

[Paul was not at all disturbed by physical facts and theories concerning the flux of matter in human bodies. He cared not whether all the material of our frames is changed once in seven years or once in twelve months. Such a question did not rise within

the horizon of his thinking: it was impossible that it should. Neither does he raise the issue, hotly debated by scientists and theologians, touching what is necessary to constitute the identity of the *buried* with the *risen* body, and the integrity and continuity of personal existence. Identity of body is assumed by the apostle in the very notion of resurrection. The body is sown, the body is raised: four times does Paul employ this formula, and, in his simplicity, he never dreamed that anybody, theologian or scientist, could mistake his meaning. Again: it is *this corruptible* which must put on incorruption, and *this mortal* which must put on immortality. So much is fairly implied in, and may be concluded from, the form of Paul's teaching on this subject.

But when we pass from this virtual assumption, or implicit

assertion, of identity, to discuss the necessary elements of identity, we leave Paul behind, and enter upon an extra-biblical field involving much science and speculative theology. We may, with Dr. Whedon, advocate the molecular identity of the dying and the rising body, so that the very material deposited in the grave is raised from it in the resurrection, assuming, to secure this view, as Dr. Whedon does, that by some secret law God insures that the same matter shall never be organic in two bodies at the moment of death. Or, as Dr. Summers is disposed to allow, we may hold, in view of the molecular changes in our present body which do not destroy physical or personal identity, that "if portions of the same kind of matter, oxygen, hydrogen, etc., which make up the mortal body, be taken from the elements at hand, without regard to their previous state, and be made to bear an analogy to that body, so as to be recognized as proper to the spirit informing it, . . . this will fulfill all the necessary conditions of physical identity." (See Summers's "Commentary on the Ritual," p. 80.) Whatever view we adopt, it is only important to recognize the fact that Paul discusses no such question as this in the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians, and that in such theorizing or dogmatizing we are within the sphere of science and pure speculation. If we profess *to interpret* Paul, *we must not read such distinctions into* his presentation of the case.

Paul is discussing not *Identity*, but *Change*. The opponent he is meeting is the Gnostic with his objection that matter is in its very constitution corruptible; that the resurrection of a material body to an incorruptible and immortal existence is, in the nature of the

case, an absurdity in thought and an impossibility in fact. Since the molecular constitution of matter necessarily involves corruption and decay, this Gnostic argues that matter is essentially evil, and, consequently, that the resurrection of our bodies is undesirable in itself. The apostle's answer to all this is summed up in one word—*Change*; and this word is the key to his teachings concerning the body of the resurrection.

Take Paul's fundamental illustration. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." Stalk, blade, flower, fruit are not more different from the bare seed placed in the ground than the resurrection body is from the present, mortal body. God gives the corn, the wheat, the barley, the rye a body as it has pleased him, and to each seed its body in kind, this kind being originally selected

by the free volition of the Deity himself, prompted by his unerring wisdom. So has he selected the resurrection body, and so shall his power bestow it upon us.

Paul continues: Look at the various forms of matter in nature. All flesh is not the same flesh: men, beasts, birds, and fishes are differently organized. There are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial: perhaps meaning, as many critical commentators hold, angels and men. Lastly, sun, moon, and stars differ among themselves as manifestations of material glory. In view of all these examples of God's control over matter and its phenomena (Paul analogically argues), can the Gnostic consistently object that he may not finally endow men with incorruptible bodies? These differences in matter type the difference between the mortal and the immortal body.

The almost infinite change Paul now puts before us in several pairs of opposites that we may have no excuse for mistaking his doctrine: *incorruption* is set over against *corruption*; *glory* against *dishonor*; *power* against *weakness*; in short, the *spiritual* body against the *natural body*, for as surely as there is a natural body there is also a spiritual body. "As we have borne the image of the earthy," on account of our connection with the first Adam, who is of the earth, earthy, so, in order, as the natural precedes the spiritual, "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" on account of our connection with the last Adam, who is a life-giving spirit from heaven.

Again and again Paul forces upon our attention the *necessity* for change: so far appearing to assent to the Gnostic objections against

matter as at present constituted. “Flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of heaven.” “We shall not all sleep, but *we shall all be changed.*” “The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible, and we shall be changed.”* It is right to insist upon personal identity and the continuity of personal life: the Apostle contemplates no other alternative; it is right to insist upon the bodily identity implied in the very notion of resurrection; it is altogether proper for the speculative theologian to define identity and tell us what he considers necessary to constitute it, and it is right for him to meet the difficulties that science may bring forward —but we must not overlook the leading truth that Paul is here presenting. His central fact is the vast difference between the body laid in the grave and the

same body raised from the dead. He wishes to assure us that these poor bodies, which at best are lame, blind, halt, deaf, and sick unto death, shall not carry their infirmities into the world to come. The resurrection body—spiritual—is to be adjusted to an altogether different state and environment.

“When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” Mark—this is a *prospective*, not a *present*, victory. Death now reigns. His triumph is complete and universal. The *last* enemy that shall be destroyed is death. We cannot claim this victory when we stand at the open graves of our dead. Death, as he snatches the loved one from our embrace, is undisputed victor. No one can contest the prize. When we are called upon to lie down in death, we are vanquished. The battle for life goes against us. But Jesus Christ is a perfect Redeemer, and his perfect work can stop short of nothing less than the salvation of soul and body alive in heaven. Man’s dual nature is one in the integrity of his person: that person a faint adumbration and type of the person of the Son of God. A complete Saviour guarantees the salvation of this man in his unity and entirety. This is accomplished in the resurrection; then the body is freed from the thralldom of death and the grave. Only in that day can we with a triumphant propriety lift the exultant paean, *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*

The sting of death is sin. Death entered into the world and passed upon all men through sin. But the power of sin is the law;

for sin is not imputed where there is no law. But Jesus Christ has satisfied the claims of the violated law, and God has given us the victory through him. Note the fundamental terms brought forward by the apostle in this narrow compass: Death, Sin, Law, Victory, Jesus Christ. Death implies sin. Sin implies law. Jesus begins with the law and works back through this death-dealing line until he smites the king of terrors on his throne, and snatches victory from the very jaws of death and hell. He is now possessed of the keys of death and of *Hades*. Death and *Hades* must deliver up the dead that are in them, and then be cast into the lake of fire. Jesus Christ satisfies the law, expiates sin, and abolishes death. He is the

Death of death, and hell's destruction.]

§ 5. Immortality of the Soul.

338
As it regards the soul, natural science has nothing to say. The speculations of philosophers and the dreams of poets are alike inutile on this subject, they prove nothing—

Nor point one step beyond the grave.

No, *not a step!* They could argue about the immortality of the soul, inferring it from the soul's immateriality, its wonderful powers, its longing after immortality, its natural repugnance to extinction, and the like—but all that proved nothing. The philosophers laughed at the fables of the poets and priests, just as we laugh at the necromantic nonsense and knavery of spirit-rappers and their hare-brained dupes. Apart from divine revelation there is nothing, absolutely nothing, known of the world beyond the grave: so far as nature testifies it cannot be shown that the soul survives the body. The Bible, however, clearly reveals the immortality of the soul,[1] and its existence in the intermediate state, apart from the body. Hence Paul speaks of being absent from the body and present with the Lord. John saw multitudes of ransomed spirits in his visions of heaven. We do not say that the soul could not be annihilated. He who created could destroy it; but he has never said that he will destroy

339

any soul in the sense of annihilation; and it is over-bold in us to say it for him.

§ 6. No Sleep of the Soul.

As there will be no annihilation so there will be no sleep of the soul. The Bible is far from inculcating *psychopannychy*. The souls in Paradise are represented as in a state of great activity. “They rest not day and night,” “they serve him day and night”—that is, they are perpetually and joyfully engaged “in work and worship so divine.”

§ 7. Development in the Separate State.

Without sanctioning the modern figment of evolution, we infer from what Scripture says on the subject that, as there is a development of all our powers in this world, till they are trammeled by the infirmities of the failing body, so there will be a development, only on a larger scale and in an unending duration in that blessed world, where there is no corruptible body to press down the incorruptible soul. Let us see what that development involves in regard to the faculties of the soul.

The intellect expands in proportion to the extent of its exercise and the ideas which it gains. But in heaven it is always active, and the objects which engage its attention are the most glorious and varied and everlasting. How the intellect must grow!

Then shall I see and hear and know
All I desired or wished below,
And every power find sweet employ
In that eternal world of joy.

Then there are the sensibilities. How must they be developed amid the friendships and loves and joys of the heavenly world! In the kingdom of grace they are greatly developed:

And if our fellowship below
In Jesus be so sweet,
What height of rapture shall we know
When round his throne we meet!

It is so with the will. By constant direction toward worthy objects and operations in this world, it gathers strength, and fixity, and sovereignty over every thing that would control our action. How much more must it be so in the better land! It will never lose its freedom: it is absurd to say that liberty will

ever develop into necessity. A free moral agent is the noblest work of God. But all the motives brought to bear upon the soul in heaven through all eternity are adapted to develop all its conative power, so that any irresolution or wavering in regard to duty will be as virtually out of the question as if it were philosophically impossible. The will will flow on forever in harmony with the divine will, and, like an ever-rolling stream, gather momentum and power as it flows on through the eternal ages.

§ 8. Infants in the Intermediate State.

This doctrine of development has a peculiar bearing upon the case of infants.

There is but one passage in the Bible which bears directly upon the *post-mortem* state of infants—if that does: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of heaven," or "of God," here means the Church on earth, but the Church militant has its development in the Church triumphant, and that consists in the translation of its subjects to that higher sphere. Thus the statement is tantamount to a declaration that they have an interest in the heavenly world, which they cannot forfeit if they die in infancy.

The horrible decree of Augustin, "the hard father of infants," and of Calvin, his disciple, and their followers, that some infants are non-elect, and that they will be damned—though their damnation will not be as deep as that of older reprobates—makes God worse than the devil—worse than "murderer Moloch," who made them pass through a fire which soon exhausted its tormenting force.

The good but visionary Dr. Watts was shocked at this, as well he might be; but he suggested that the children of the wicked were annihilated! He does not say how wicked they must be, or whether both parents must be wicked, to insure annihilation, or whether one good parent would secure eternal life to the child; and he never seems to have thought of the principle of atavism, which allows of

the baptism of children of wicked parents, if any of their predecessors were pious. But despite their old and cruel creeds, Calvinists, as well as other Christians, hold that all who die in infancy are transported to heaven, there to live forever.

Here comes in the doctrine of development. It is asked, What can an infant do in heaven? We say, with a good Baptist,

341

Millions of infant souls compose
The family above—

and we know what infants do in the family below: they develop every day. Every member of the family assists in the development. So it will be, only on a larger scale, in heaven. Shakespeare (or whoever else wrote the Yorkshire tragedy) speaks of babes in heaven dandled in the laps of the angels, and a poet of our own day says, "A babe in glory is a babe forever." There may be a basis of truth in this. Infants in heaven may draw out the tender regards of angels and saints—and why not add the Saviour himself, who took such an affectionate interest in them when on the earth? It requires no Scripture—hence there is none—to prove that infantile spirits must rapidly develop amid the exciting and varied scenes and associations of the heavenly world. Acting independently of all sense-relations and sense-media, their intellect, sensibilities, and will, coming in direct contact with objects so attractive, must expand with marvelous rapidity. As their seniors develop as rapidly in their sphere, they may always be in advance of them in the grand march—the eternal progress—so that forever the distinction may in some sort remain. But this verges on the nebulous, and we recede into the light. Our faith can behold the infantile heirs of immortality, acting, and being acted upon, by the law of development—changed from glory to glory.

In his lyric poems Watts has "An Elegiac Thought on Mrs. Annie Warner, who died December 18, 1707, a few days after the birth and death of her first child," in which he says

Or does she seek or has she found her babe
Among the infant retinue of the blest,
And clasped her to her soul, to satiate there
The young maternal passion, and absolve
The unfulfilled embrace! Thrice happy child,
That saw the light and turned its eyes aside

From our dim regions to the Eternal Sun,
And led the parent's way to glory! There
Thou art forever hers, *with powers enlarged,*
For love reciprocal and sweet converse.

§ 9. Unenlightened Persons in the Intermediate State.

By the same token we conclude that persons ill-instructed in this life will have a new departure under more favorable conditions in the life to come, provided they are not incorrigibly

342

bad. By a misinterpretation of certain passages of Scripture, some maintain that heathens, Mohammedans, and other unenlightened persons, will all necessarily be damned—damned for not believing in a Saviour of whom they never heard! for not professing a creed never proposed to them! for not obeying a law which was never promulged to them! It is astounding that men will hold dogmas so horrifying to our humanity, so repulsive to our reason, so contrary to our common sense!

There are, of course, retributions for incorrigible sinners of this class—light, indeed, compared with the heavy retributions for incorrigible sinners who well "knew their duty and who did it not." But, as Dr. Olin used to say, "God will save everybody that he can." Here comes in the law of development: If, under the rubbish which has accumulated on the minds of these poor creatures, God sees the germ of goodness, a concurrence with preventing grace which is given to every child of man, through the merciful economy of redemption, what hinders that they should be placed in some low condition in heaven, corresponding to their moral and intellectual *status?* And what hinders that they should begin instantly to develop in that land where "everlasting spring abides," a genial clime, where the merest germ will soon expand, and the smallest bud will soon burst into beauty and send forth its fragrance on the paradisaic air!

We have engaged to keep from the enchantments of imagination; but we must say that we have often imagined the action of a soul of this class, when admitted into that blissful region, and when his eyes were attracted by the cynosure of all eyes —the Lamb in the midst of the throne, bearing "the dear tokens of

his passion”—and when told by some friendly angel or redeemed spirit that he was indebted to his grace for admission into that blissful region, how earnestly would he run to cast himself at the Saviour’s feet, hardly forbearing to denounce the heartless Church which denied him the lamp of life when he was on this dark and sin-cursed earth! No place for such a one in heaven? Then there is no place in the universe for a heaven!

§ 10. No Universalism.

There is no necessity of verging toward universalism in extending this merciful provision to many in Christendom who are born and bred in circumstances but little better than those which surround the heathen on the Ganges or the Yang-tse-Kiang. No;

343

this is not universalism. The principle does not apply to such as are specified in the account of the great assize in Matt. xxv., who for their dereliction of well-known duty are sentenced to “everlasting punishment.”

§ 11. No Purgatory.

There is no purgatory in the map of the world beyond the grave. That is a Romish myth. The texts of Scripture adduced for it are foreign from it—even that fabulous passage in 2 Maccabees, where Judas is said to have ordered sacrifices to be offered for the sins of the idolatrous Jews who died in battle, speaks nothing for purgatory. The elder Romanists, and Romanists still in benighted papal regions, describe their purgatory as a dark region just above hell, but under heaven, where the souls of those who die in venial sin are roasted on spits with material fire, until, by the suffrages of saints in heaven, and Christians on earth, they are relieved and admitted into heaven. They assert that apparitions from purgatory make revelations to this effect. But in Protestant countries they modify their teaching. They say there is indeed a place between heaven and hell, called purgatory; but there is no material fire there —the penitents in purgatory are consumed in the flames of strong desire to be admitted into the society of the blessed whom they see

afar off in Abraham's bosom. The plausible sophism that none of us are fit for heaven at the time of death, but all need some punishment and some purgation, to make us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, is so transparent that a child versed in Scripture can readily see through it.

We are indebted to Christ, whose blood applied by the Holy Spirit cleanseth from all sin, for our meetness for heaven, and "our titles to heaven his merits we take." Then as to special personal congruity for the enjoyments, employments, and associations of heaven, here comes in again the law of development, which extends to all states and conditions of men who are not incorrigibly bad.

§ 12. No New Probation in the Separate State.

As there is no purgatory in the other world, so there is no new probation there—at least, we find no proof in the Scripture that there is. Many learned and excellent evangelical German theologians think there is. Dr. Paley suggested that there

might be. A mistaken view of Peter's reference to Christ preaching by Noah to the antediluvians, now in the prison of hell, is cited for this speculation—which has nothing better for its support than this false exegesis. The retribution of the other world is for the deeds done in the body—done in this world. Whether or not men will be rewarded for the good deeds they do in heaven, or punished for the bad deeds done in hell does not concern this discussion. We shall be under law to all eternity, and where there is a law there must be sanctions to guard it, or to prompt to obedience and deter from disobedience. But it does not appear that any terms will be offered after death, or propositions set forth, prescribing repentance, faith, and obedience, as in this world, on the performance or non-performance of which men will be assigned to heaven or hell.

§ 13. Degrees in the Future State.

The Bible evidently teaches us that by the law of moral attraction every one leaving this world will go to his own place in the next, whether heaven or hell—purgatory there is none. Moral

affinity and capacity will determine every man's eternal destiny. Thus well-instructed and cultured believers will move in a higher sphere than heathens, infants, and others whose characters were not formed under so favorable conditions. This will, indeed, result in great inequalities in heaven; but it is revealed in the Scriptures that there are various degrees of glory in heaven as there are various degrees of retribution in hell—variety runs through all the universe—and "every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." Some will "scarcely be saved;" they will pass as it were unobserved into some obscure nook in Paradise, wondering themselves at their admission. Others who have done some good service for "the Captain of their salvation" shall have an ovation decreed them; while others, who have well "contested the noble contest" (τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι, 2 Tim. iv. 7), shall enjoy a triumph—"an entrance shall be ministered unto them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"—they shall be forever housed in the *triumphalis domus*, the most splendid mansion in the Father's house—they shall be

> Foremost of the saints in light,
> Nearest the eternal throne.

---

1. "What in modern times has been called the immortality of the soul," says Bishop Martensen ("Christian Dogmatics," p. 451), "is only a meager and faint reflection of the rich hope of Christianity. Christian hope does not merely expect immortality, which is a negative theory, but eternal life, including not only the resurrection of the soul and spirit, but the resurrection of the body. And Christianity does not merely embrace the perfection of the individual man; the perfection of the individual is only one part of the perfection of the entire kingdom, yea, of the whole creation (Rom. viii. 18–24; Phil. iii. 20, 21), which is accomplished at the same time with our Lord's Second Advent, to judge both the quick and the dead. Christian hope, therefore, takes the form of an apocalyptic vision, embracing in its view Christ and his fellowship, the Church and the world, history and nature, death and *Hades*, resurrection and judgment, heaven and hell. Science can present the fullness of Christian hope in the generality of thought only. It is because Christian hope refers us to an activity which lies beyond the conditions of experience, because eternal life has its natural side, which within these

conditions we cannot understand, our knowledge is necessarily partial and restricted. While science, therefore, can present these prophetical parts of doctrine only in general terms, it must be left to Christian art and poetry to anticipate individual views of this subject in images full of presage, those views being embodied in the canonical apocalypse, which is presented in its fullness in the Revelation of St. John."—T.↩

Chapter II. No Intermediate Place.

§ 1. Paradise.

345

Among all the figurative terms which are used to designate this state and place, none is so popular and suggestive as “Paradise.” This word, as well as the Hebrew, *Pardes* (Neh. ii. 8; Eccl. ii. 5; Cant. iv. 13) is derived from the languages of Eastern Asia—Armenian, Sanskrit, etc.—and denotes a garden or park, like that which surrounded a Persian palace. Hence it is used in the Septuagint for the garden of Eden (Gen. ii. 8, *seq.*, Jos. Ant. i. 1–3). It is not used in the Old Testament for heaven; but it is so employed three times in the New Testament, to-wit: Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7.

It is astonishing that so judicious a lexicographer as Dr. Robinson should refer it in Luke xxiii. 43, to “the inferior paradise, or the region of the blessed in *Hades*.” The notion that the place of disembodied spirits is called *Hades*—one part of *Hades* being occupied by the good, and that called “Paradise;” and the other by the bad, called *Gehenna*, *Tartarus*, “Hell”—is a perfect myth. *Hades* never designates any thing good. In the Bible it always means the grave, or state of the dead, referring to their bodies, and never to their departed spirits—except in one place where it is used parabolically, Luke xvi. Paradise is the region of the blessed in heaven, not in hell. The spirit of Christ, while his body was in the grave—*hades*—was in heaven, whither the spirit of the converted thief went, and where it has remained ever since, and will remain with all other disembodied spirits of the good, till the resurrection, and after that with their bodies forever and ever. When Christ said to Mary, “Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father” (John xx. 17), he meant that he had not yet ascended to heaven and returned to “receive them unto himself,” either in the sense which he intended, or in that which they erroneously gave to his promise. His spirit went there after his death, but that was not his ascension, which includes his

346

body as well as his soul; and in that case was obviously embraced, as it was his body and not his soul that Mary touched. It is absurd to distinguish between the paradise in Luke and that in Rev. ii. 7, because in the latter case it is called "the paradise of God!" Is there any other paradise than the paradise of God? When Paul says, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter"—it is obvious that he refers to but one rapture—that which occurred above fourteen years before he wrote about it—and in that one and the same rapture he heard these unspeakable things. He varies the name because of the parentheses, and because the word paradise is descriptive of the third heaven where God resides—and which must have impressed his imagination as a garden of delight.

In like manner it impressed John in the Apocalypse. Christ says, Rev. ii. 7: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of God"—referring to the garden of Eden, παράδεισος being used for it in the LXX. Accordingly, when the evangelist describes heaven in Rev. xxii., he has his eye upon the garden of Eden, which he sets forth as *rus in urbe*—the most charming picture to an Oriental imagination: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bore twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." What this magnificent imagery may denote we cannot tell—the two apostles who beheld it in vision could not fully portray it, much less expound it. It is very clear that wherever in the universe it is, there is the peculiar residence or throne of God—there is the God-man, with his glorified body whom the heavens must receive, or retain, till the time of the restitution of all things—there

are the holy angels; there are the spirits of just men made perfect,

and there shall their bodies be after the resurrection.

§ 2. Poetical Use of "Paradise."

That beautiful figurative term, *paradise*, may indeed be used poetically to distinguish the intermediate state from the state of consummation, designated as "perfect heaven." But that, like the words Sabbath, Canaan, etc., may be also used to set forth the state of perfect love enjoyed on earth. Thus Charles Wesley, referring to the latter:

O let thy gracious Spirit guide
And bring me to the promised land,
Where righteousness and peace reside,
And all submit to love's command:

A land where milk and honey flow.
And springs of pure delights arise,
Delights which I shall shortly know,
When I regain my paradise.

Rejoicing now in earnest hope,
I stand, and, from the mountain-top,
See all the land below:
Rivers of milk and honey rise,
And all the fruits of paradise
In endless plenty grow.

When God is mine, and I am his,
Of paradise possessed,
I taste unutterable bliss.
And everlasting rest.

O Jesus, at thy feet we wait
Till thou shalt bid us rise.
Restored to our unsinning state,
To love's sweet paradise.

Remove this hardness from my heart.
This unbelief remove:
To me the rest of faith impart.
The Sabbath of thy love.

Yet in other places the same poet makes paradise designate the

intermediate state—*e. g.*:

With ease our souls through death shall glide
Into their paradise;
And thence on wings of angels ride.
Triumphant through the skies.
Yet when the fullest joy is given.
The same delight we prove:

348

In earth, in paradise, in heaven.
Our all in all is love.

But for the most part the Sabbath is spoken of as the

Type of that everlasting rest
The saints enjoy in heaven.

So Watts employs Canaan:

Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood
Stand dressed in living green;
So to the Jews old Canaan stood
While Jordan rolled between.

Charles Wesley also identifies paradise with heaven:

Happy who in Christ delight
And his commandments love.
They shall keep their gracious right
To paradise above;
Eat the immortalizing tree.
From which they can no more be driven;
Feast on full felicity.
And live the life of heaven.

§ 3. Heaven the Place of Disembodied Spirits.

The place of disembodied spirits is the same as that which shall be occupied by the saints after the resurrection. That place is *heaven*, figuratively styled *paradise*.

When Christ left the world, forty days after his resurrection, "he was carried up into heaven" (Luke xxiv. 51), "he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God" (Mark xvi. 19).

"The Son of man ascended up where he was before" (John vi. 62). "I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God" (John xx. 17). "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John xiv. 2, 3). "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11). "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand" (Ps. cx. 1; Acts ii. 34). "Whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21). Consequently, when he shall make his second advent he will descend from heaven (as it is in the Creed), and bring with him the disembodied spirits of the saints. "For if we believe that Jesus

died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him"—to be reunited with their bodies raised from the grave—"and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. iv. 14–16.)

Accordingly Stephen when martyred, "being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said: Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God; and he said, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (Acts vii. 55, 56, 59.) "Christ is even at the right hand of God." (Rom. viii. 34.)

If the saints go to paradise at death, and if they go to Christ, then paradise is heaven, because that is where Christ is: his glorified body is there, and nowhere else, and never will be anywhere else. His disembodied spirit was there; our disembodied spirits will be there; and there too is his glorified body. There also will be our glorified bodies, when they are made like unto his: ever with the Lord.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God,

who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight): we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." (2 Cor. v. 1–9.) If this passage is not mere rant, it teaches that when the spirits of the good leave their bodies at death, they are ushered into the presence of the Lord; and where he is we are not left to conjecture: in his Father's house, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens: not in *limbus*, *purgatory hades*, but in paradise, in heaven.

Then again, look at Paul's deliverance: "I am in a strait betwixt

two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (Phil. i. 23, 24.) It is insulting to one's common sense to suggest that this can mean any thing else than what it says, that when we cease to "live in the flesh" (verse 22), we shall "be with Christ, which is far better." Where is Christ? In what place? In what state? In a state of unconsciousness, or, as the soul-sleepers say, in *lethargus*—is that better than serving Christ and his Church in the body, in this world? Paul says: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain" (verse 21). Call ye that gain? The sleep of the soul—insensibility, unconsciousness—is that gain? Was the great apostle indeed beside himself? Jerome charged Vigilantius with asserting the sleep of the soul, but he has been defended from the charge of the not overscrupulous Father. In the twelfth century, Pope Innocent III. condemned the fanatics who held this absurd conceit, which was revived by some Anabaptists and Socinians in the sixteenth century, and by some Germans and a few Anglicans and Unitarians—especially materialists like Dr. Priestley—in succeeding centuries. But it is hardly necessary to refute so absurd a conceit—yet it is not more preposterous than the notion that the saints are relegated to some unknown part of the universe—some gloomy *hades* or *limbus*, neither in earth nor heaven.

Dr. Knapp ("Christian Theology," Sec. 148) says:

> According to the doctrine of the New Testament, therefore, there is no third place, or medium, between heaven and hell or between being happy and miserable, although there are very different degrees both of the one

and of the other. The intermediate condition of which we have spoken must not be understood to imply any thing like this. Still an opinion like this got footing very early in the Christian Church. And this gave rise to the custom of *praying for the dead*, since men were foolish enough to imagine that there is room to obtain an alteration in the yet undecided destiny of departed spirits, while in truth their destiny must depend solely upon their own actions during the present life. This custom had become very general in the fourth century, and was at that time opposed by Aërius, presbyter of Pontus, as we learn from the testimony of Epiphanius, who is very indignant against him on this account. It was also opposed by the Spanish presbyter, Vigilantius, in the fifth century, in reply to whom Hieronymus wrote a violent book. This doctrine was afterward brought into connection with that respecting *purgatory*, and then followed *masses for souls*, as sacrifices for the departed. There are also some traces of *prayers for the dead* even among the Grecian Jews—*e. g.*, 2 Mac. xii. 43–46: ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν προσεύχεσθαι.

Chapter III. The Intermediate State.

§ 1. The Doctrine Stated and Proved.

351

But though there is no intermediate place in which the soul is confined between death and the resurrection—no *limbus patrum*, just below heaven; no *limbus infantum* for unbaptized children, or *purgatory*, just above hell, for unsanctified Christians, as the Papists dream—yet there is an intermediate state, which some have strangely confounded with the intermediate place—the *hades*, grave, or dormitory of souls—of which the Bible is silent. Thus Dr. Shedd ("History of Christian Doctrine," Part II., pp. 400–403):

> The opinions of the early fathers concerning the residence of the soul in its disembodied state, between death and the resurrection, were somewhat fluctuating. The idea of a *Hades*, or under-world, where departed spirits dwell, was familiar to the Hebrew mind as it was to the Greek, and so far as this idea passed over to Christianity it tended to the doctrine of a state intermediate between this earthly life and the everlasting abode of the soul assigned to it in the day of judgment. Justin Martyr represents the souls of the righteous as taking up a temporary abode in a happy, and those of the wicked in a wretched, place; and stigmatizes as heretical the doctrine that souls are immediately received into heaven at death. Tertullian held that the martyrs went at once to the abode of the blessed, but that this was a privilege peculiar to them, and not granted to other Christians. Cyprian, on the other hand, says nothing of an intermediate state, and expresses the confident belief that those who die in the Lord, by pestilence or by any other mode, will be at once taken to him. In the Alexandrine school, the idea of an intermediate state passed into that of a gradual purification of the soul, and paved the way for the later papal doctrine of purgatory. The doctrine of an intermediate state not only maintained itself, but gained in authority and influence during the polemic period (A.D. 250–730). Ambrose taught that the soul is separated from the body at death, and after the cessation of the earthly life is held in an ambiguous condition (*ambiguo suspenditur*), awaiting the final judgment. Augustine remarks that "the period (*tempus*) which intervenes between the death and the final resurrection of man contains souls in secret receptacles, who are treated according to their character and conduct in the flesh." "The majority of ecclesiastical writers of this period," Hagenbach remarks, "believed that men do not receive their full reward till after the resurrection of the body."

Here and there, however, there was a dissenting voice. Gregory Nazianzen supposed that the souls of the righteous, prior to the resurrection of the body, are at once admitted

into the presence of God; in which opinion he seems to be supported by Gennadius and Gregory the Great. Eusebius also declares that Helena, the mother of Constantine, went immediately to God, and was transformed into an angelic substance. In the Middle Ages and the Papal Church, the doctrine of an intermediate state was, of course, retained and defended in connection with that of purgatory. In the Protestant Church, the doctrine of purgatory was rejected; but some difference of sentiment appears respecting the intermediate state. Calvin combated the theory of a sleep of the soul between death and the resurrection (psychopannychy), which had been revived by some of the Swiss Anabaptists, and argues for the full consciousness of the disembodied spirit. The Second Helvetic Confession expressly rejects the notion that departed spirits re-appear on earth. Some theologians endeavored to establish a distinction between the happiness which the disembodied spirit enjoys, and that which it will experience after the resurrection of the body. They also distinguished between the judgment which takes place at the death of each individual, by which his destiny is immediately decided, and the general judgment at the end of the world. Speaking generally, the doctrine of an intermediate state has found most favor in the Lutheran division of Protestants. In the English Church, since the time of Laud, the doctrine has found some advocates, chiefly in that portion of it characterized by High-church views, and a Romanizing tendency. The followers of Swedenborg adopt the tenet in a highly gross and materializing form.

Every one knows that the body will not be raised till “the last day,” the day of judgment; not till then will the righteous receive their full reward or the wicked their full punishment. (Matt. viii. 29; Rom. ii. 6–16; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6.) In the intermediate state the righteous will be as happy as they can be without their glorified bodies, and without the association of all the elect; every one will be happy according to his capacity for enjoyment. But their state is obviously one of expectancy as well as of enjoyment.

The saints from his propitious eye
Await their several crowns.

Thus Paul, speaking as a victorious athlete, says: “The noble contest I have contested, the race I have finished, the faith I have maintained. Henceforth there awaiteth me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award me

at that day: and not to me only, but to all those also who love his appearing." He has run the race, and gained the goal; he is as sure of his crown as if it were on his head; but he will not be crowned till all the athletes shall have completed the contest. Then all the victors shall be crowned together; and with them too, in a certain sense, Jesus himself, the great Forerunner. He shall then see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. As

the great Agonist, for the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. There too are his faithful followers, and he and they shall have their full and eternal reward "in that day." Christ, indeed, as the Captain of their salvation, is perfect in a sense in which they are not perfect, because he has his glorified body—they have not theirs. But they are happy in the assurance that they will get them in due time. "For our conversation [citizenship] is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. iii. 20, 21.)

If the resurrection body were to be a "vile body"—"the body of our humiliation," like the present body—then we might deprecate rather than desire it; but it is not so. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." (1 Cor. xv. 42–44.)

There are three degrees or stages of perfection:

1. Perfect holiness, to be enjoyed in this life. (1 John iv. 17.)
2. Perfect exemption from evil, to be enjoyed in the intermediate state. (Heb. xii. 23.)
3. Perfect glory after the resurrection. (Phil. iii. 14–16.)

Beautiful, and orthodox as beautiful, is that passage in the Burial Service of the Church of England:

Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful are in joy and felicity: we give thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world; beseeching thee that it may please thee of thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of

thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom, that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

§ 2. Objections to the Intermediate State Answered.

Dr. Watts, in his admirable essay on a Separate State, says: "I know what the opposers of the separate state reply here, viz., that the whole time from death to the resurrection is but as the sleep of a night, and the dead shall awake out of their graves, utterly ignorant and insensible of the long distance of time that

has passed since their death. One year or one thousand years will be the same thing to them; and therefore they should be as careful to prepare for the day of judgment, and the rewards that attend it, as they are for their entrance into the separate state at death, if there were any such state to receive them." After showing that "the force of divers terms is greatly enervated by this delay of punishment," he says: "Amongst those who delay the season of recompense till the resurrection there are some who suppose the soul to exist still as a distinct being from the body, but to pass the whole interval of time in a state of stupor or sleep, being altogether unconscious and inactive. Others again imagine that the soul itself has not a sufficient distinction from the body to give it any proper existence when the body dies; but that its existence shall be renewed at the resurrection of the body, and then be made the subject of joy or pain, according to its behaviour in this mortal state." He overthrows these notions by showing that "the soul is a conscious and active principle made after the image of God, who is all conscious activity; and it is still the same being, whether it be united to an animal body or separated from it. If the body die, the soul still exists, an active and conscious power in principle or being; and if it ceases to be conscious and active, I think it ceases to be; for I have no conception of what remains. Now if the conscious principle continue conscious after death, it will not be in a mere conscious indolence. The good man and the wicked will not have the same indolent existence. Virtue or vice in the very temper of his being, when absent from matter or body, will become a pleasure or a pain

to the conscience of a separated spirit."

Dr. Watts adduces what he modestly calls "Some probable arguments for the separate state," as contained in the following texts: Ps. lxxiii. 24, 26; Eccl. xii. 7; Isa. lvii. 1, 2; Luke ix. 30, 31; John v. 24, *et al.*; Acts vii. 59; Rom. viii. 10, 11; 2 Cor. v. 1, 2; xii. 2, 3; Phil. i. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 14; v. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18–20; Jude 7. By referring to these texts, it will be seen that they nearly all positively prove the point in hand. He then adduces what he calls "Some firmer or more evident proofs of a separate state," as contained in the following passages: Matt. x. 28; Luke xvi. 26–28; xx. 37, 38; Phil. i. 23, 24; Heb. xii. 22–24; 2 Pet. i. 13, 14. He alludes to those pertinent passages in the Apocrypha, Wisdom iii. 1–4; iv. 7. It may not be amiss to epitomize

the answers of Dr. Watts to the objections urged against the separate state.

Objection:

1. That the Scripture speaks of the death of the soul. But soul—*nephesh* (Heb.), *psyche* (Greek), *anima* (Latin)—frequently denotes the animal life, or the person, living or dead, as in Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 31. "The soul of Christ was not left in hell or the grave." Here is no reference to the spirit, but to the body after the spirit was dismissed from it.
2. David and Solomon speak of the dead as not knowing any thing. But this only refers to their having no more concern with the affairs of this life. David explains it when he says, "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the *grave* who shall give thee thanks?" (Ps. vi. 5.)
3. It is objected that Christ's people will not be with him till he comes for them, and that must be at the resurrection. (John xiv. 3.) Admitting that this refers to the second advent at the end of the world, it proves nothing against the intermediate state, for, as Watts says, "The separate souls of his followers should be favored with his presence in Paradise before his public coming to judge the world. Though the last and greatest blessing be only mentioned here, it does not exclude the former." Their entire persons, body and soul, and all collectively shall be received on the last day.
4. A similar answer is given to an objection based on Phil. iii.

10, 11. Paul expected to be with Christ immediately after death, but he did not look for his full reward till the resurrection to life, which he was laboring to secure.

5. The objection drawn from 1 Cor. xv. 13, 18, 19, 32, Watts answers by showing that the apostle in the *anastasis*, or resurrection, here spoken of, comprehended the whole future state, beginning at death; but he refers particularly to the resurrection of the body, because he is speaking of the martyrdom of the body. "There must be a resurrection of the body, to encourage sufferings in the body, for the sake of virtue and religion."
6. He answers the objection drawn from the referring of rewards and punishments to the time of the resurrection, by showing that the very text adduced for this (1 Thess. iv. 14, 17, 18) proves that the spirits of the righteous had been with Christ in the separate state, because it is said they shall be brought with him when he descends to raise their bodies—their rewards will then

be publicly declared; they will be complete in body and soul, and this union will be eternal.
7. The objection drawn from the promise of long life as a reward of virtue in the Old Testament is met by the statement that by a long life more good may be done for man and more glory be brought to God—to which we add, thus the final reward may be enhanced.
8. The objection drawn from the translation of Enoch and Elijah is met by the statement that this was a peculiar honor bestowed upon them—to which we add that it was as much for the benefit of others as for themselves, as it demonstrated the fact of immortality to the patriarchs and the Jews, just as the resurrection of Christ demonstrated it under our dispensation.
9. The objection drawn from the restoring of sundry persons to life is met by the statement that they may have been kept out of heaven, as it were in a state of sleep till they were resuscitated, which is not likely; but Watts adds that no harm was done them if they were good, and much benefit if they were bad. He indorses the ancient opinion that those who rose at the time of Christ's resurrection ascended with him

body and soul to heaven, which we think unlikely. These phenomena have no bearing on the question.

10. The objection drawn from the resurrection of the martyrs (Rev. xx. 4, 5) is set aside by the fact that this is not a literal bodily resurrection, but the revival of the cause for which the martyrs were put to death—the spirit of zeal and devotion—as our Wesley expresses it:

    Such as in the martyrs glowed,
    Dying champions for their God.

11. The objection drawn from the fact that in Scripture man is represented as one being, is overthrown by the fact that the soul and body of this one being are plainly distinguished, showing that there must be a separate state of existence for souls after death. The case of the rich man and Lazarus is in point: their bodies were buried, but their souls were in the spiritual world.
12. The objection drawn from death being called a sleep is met by the statement that that is predicated of the body, not of the soul, which never sleeps—"death is called sleep, because,

during that state men are cut off from the business of this world, though the soul may think and act in another."
13. The objection that the Scripture does not mention a particular judgment at death is met by a reference to Heb. ix. 27, which seems to refer to the particular sentence of determination passed upon every soul at death, though the public and general and final judgment is reserved to the last day.
14. The objection that there is no need of a resurrection if the saints can be happy in the disembodied state is met by the obvious fact that they can and will be made happier in their glorified body and consummated state.
15. The objection that our immortality is built upon the incorruptible state of our new-raised bodies (1 Cor. xv. 53) is met by the statement that this refers to the immortality of the body which will be constructed of incorruptible materials; but the soul is immortal in itself, whether with or without a body—whether or not it is necessarily immortal in its own nature. "But," says this acute reasoner, "whether the great God, the governor of the world, has not appointed souls to exist, in a

separate state of happiness or misery, after the bodies are dead, seems to me to be so plainly determined in many of the scriptures which have been cited, as leaves no sufficient reason to doubt of the truth of it."

§ 3. Bishop Martensen's Analysis.

[Bishop Martensen, "Christian Dogmatics," p. 461, thus tersely summarizes the revealed doctrine of man's three successive states of existence:

According to the fundamental representations of revelation, the life of man is to be lived in three cosmical spheres; first, the sphere in which we dwell in the flesh, ἐν *σα*ρκί, our present life, whose prevailing bias is sensible and outward—for not only is all spiritual activity conditioned by sense, but the spirit groans under the tyranny of the flesh; next a sphere in which we live, ἐν πνεύ*ματι*, wherein spirituality and inwardness is the fundamental feature—and this is the intermediate state; and, lastly, a sphere in which we shall again live in the body, but in a glorified body, and in a glorified nature, which is perfection.]

Chapter IV. The State of Consummation, or Post-Resurrection State.

358

The state of consummation comprehends all the good realized in the intermediate state, of which it is the full development. It comprises the following particulars:

§ 1. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Sin.

There will be perfect and eternal exemption from sin. “And there shall in nowise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.” (Rev. xxi. 27.)

There we shall see his face,
And never, never sin.

“The possibility of sinning,” says Knapp, “will, however, still remain, as it was with man in his original innocence, and as it is with the holy angels. But the blessed saints in heaven will not *wish* to sin, for the preponderance of sense will be then removed; nor will they any longer meet with those external hinderances, those allurements to sin, which obstructed their piety here upon the earth. On the contrary, they will there have the strongest attractions and motives to piety, mere enlarged views, good examples, etc. And these means are sufficient to confirm the saints in goodness.”

This matter resolves itself into the question. Will the service rendered by saints in heaven be voluntary or compulsory? We say it will be wholly voluntary. No other could be acceptable to God. (Ps. cx. 3.) They will to a certainty serve him forever—but not by necessity. The certainty results from these ten considerations:

1. They will have personal knowledge of the evil of sin—this will, in connection with other things, keep them from tampering with it.
2. They will have an eternal memento of the evil of sin in the fate of the damned—angels and men; this will deter them

from it.

3. They will have no indwelling sin—not a spark within to be blown into a flame.
4. They will

have no temptation—from the world, the flesh, or the devil.
5. They will have a perfect knowledge of their duty—so that they will not err through ignorance or from that want of the impression made by perfect moral excellence, because of an inadequate conception of it.
6. They have illustrious examples of holiness before them—thus they will see such a beauty in holiness that they cannot but admire it, and the admiration will naturally lead to imitation.
7. They will have union with Christ and all the good and happy, all together live, move, and have their being in the element of holiness, the Holy Spirit, like a blessed atmosphere of light and love and happiness, environing them everywhere and always.
8. They will have great and glorious enjoyments—so that they will have no temptation to eke out their bliss by seeking forbidden pleasures.
9. They will have varied and satisfying employments—so that as there will be no "mischief" there to be done, there will be no "idle hands" to do it if there were: their duty will be their delight.
10. They will have the Beatitic Vision—the infinite perfections of the Triune God will fill them with wonder, love, and joy forever and ever.

Neither the angels in heaven nor Adam and Eve in Paradise, nor the sanctified on earth, had such a guaranty of eternal holiness and happiness as the saints will have in their state of consummation. (See "Butler's Analogy," Part I., Chap. v., Sec. 12.) We may be sure that "No sin in heaven is found." This will more fully appear as we proceed in the discussion.

§ 2. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Suffering.

There will be perfect and eternal exemption from suffering.

There will be no suffering as the penalty of sin. “And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity.” (Isa. xxxiii, 24.) There will, moreover, be no suffering of a disciplinary character. No remedial chastisements will be there needed, and consequently there will be none administered. “And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign forever and ever.” (Rev. xxii. 3–5.) “They shall hunger no

more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.” (Rev. vii. 16, 17.)

§ 3. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Temptation.

There will be perfect and eternal exemption from temptation. There will be no corruptible body to press down the incorruptible soul; no wicked world to beguile, ensnare, and urge us to sin; no devil to scale the walls of the heavenly Paradise as the old Serpent “at one slight bound high overleaped the verdurous wall of Paradise”—“so clomb this first grand thief into God’s fold” on earth, but into that field above no foe shall ever enter, as from it no friend shall ever depart. (Matt. xiii. 38–43; Rev. xx. 10; xxi. 27.)

§ 4. Perfect and Eternal Exemption from Toil.

There will be perfect and eternal exemption from toil. This exemption takes place immediately at death. It is then we “shuffle off this mortal coil.” “And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me. Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.” (Rev. xiv. 13.) There will be no mental fatigue, as there will be no bodily fatigue.

No more fatigue, no more distress.

"There remaineth a rest to the people of God" (Heb. iv. 9)—a *Sabbatismos*, a Sabbatic rest—an everlasting Sabbath-keeping. There are no working-days—no week-days of toil in heaven! Here the Sabbath is a blessed season of repose. How often have we exclaimed at the close of the Sabbath:

Delightful hour! how soon will night
Spread her dark mantle o'er thy reign,
And morrow's quick-returning light
Must call us to the world again.
Yet will there dawn at last a day,
A sun that never sets shall rise;
Night will not veil his ceaseless ray—
The heavenly Sabbath never dies.

§ 5. Unceasing Employment.

Yet there will be agreeable and unceasing employment. Here

361

indeed is a paradox! The same book which tells us that immediately after death and forever after the saints shall enjoy unbroken rest, tells us that "the living ones" round about the throne "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!" But there is no contradiction in this. In the disembodied state, of course, there are no physical disabilities to render our service laborious; nor will there be after the resurrection, as our glorified bodies will be freed from all grossness, all liability to derangement, all need of nutriment, and of course from all sense of fatigue—they will be incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual, literally *pneumatic*, that is, ethereal, sublimated, swift in their motion as lightning—in a sense far higher than that which the prophet meant, "they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint." The mind will be employed forever in exploring the mysteries of the perfections and works and word of God—nature, providence, and grace. The subjects will be infinitely varied, and always affording new delights.

There shall be no night there—as none will be needed. There will be no wear and tear of either body or spirit, to call for seasons of reflection and repose.

§ 6. Good Society in Heaven.

There will be good society in heaven. “But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant.” That is the nobility of the universe. They are all “the children of a king.” They have royal blood in their veins. They have all the family likeness. The saints are made like unto the angels—indeed, they are nearer the throne than they. None will be admitted into those pure and blissful regions but those who have been made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Every individual in heaven, saint or angel, will be a friend, whose thoughts and feelings and purposes will be all like our own; yet no two saints or angels will be precisely alike in character, condition, or capacity; and this will be one of the charms of the heavenly world—an infinite variety combined with an essential unity, without which there could be no harmony.

362

There will be no jarring string in the heavenly, choir! Here we are more likely to find hinderances than helps in our pursuit of knowledge and virtue and happiness, but there every inhabitant will contribute to the common weal.

This settles the question as to recognition in heaven. We certainly shall be as intelligent in heaven as we are on earth. We know each other here by sight, by hearing, by touch—by description, by correspondence, by sympathy—and why not so in heaven? Shall we not retain our identity, our personality, our individuality?

Eternal form will still divide
The eternal soul from all beside,
And I shall know him when we meet.

We shall recognize the personal *differentiae* in our glorified bodies too. A great change indeed will take place in our bodies after death and in the resurrection. “Meats for the belly and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them.” (1 Cor. vi. 13.) “The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they

which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 34–36.) There will indeed be the resurrection of the dead—of the body—*soma, corpus*—and as some of the old creeds have it, *sarx, carnis,* the flesh.

Up to the Lord our flesh shall fly
At the great rising day.

But it will not be gross flesh, like that laid in the tomb—in that sense "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." (1 Cor. xv. 50.) Here is a paradox, but no real contradiction. The dead body will be resolved into the twelve or fourteen elements of which it is constituted, and in the resurrection these elements shall be re-collected—either the identical particles, or as many of them as may be needed—for the pneumatic body, or elements of the same nature, identical in kind, just as one particle of oxygen is the same as another, possessing precisely the same properties. In the sense thus explained, we believe in the resurrection of the *flesh*, and so we sing:

363

But let us hasten to the day
Which shall our flesh restore,
When death shall all be done away,
And bodies part no more.

Now we know that our bodies receive form and feature from the souls that inform them, as doubtless our souls are modified by the bodies which they inform. We presume no one will require any argument for the assertion that the soul of one man would not suit the body of another man. It is a universal rule: "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." (1 Cor. xv. 38.) As Paul's soul differs from Peter's in the intermediate state, so his body will differ from Peter's in the post-resurrection state. Moses was recognized in the disembodied state as the great legislator of Israel, and Elijah in his spiritual body as the great restorer of the law, when they both met on the Mount of Transfiguration. Abraham and Lazarus were recognized and discriminated in the disembodied state. Christ was recognized in his

glorified body by Stephen, and Paul, and John. Angels are distinguished from saints in heaven, and one saint will be distinguished from another. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, says: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and joy." (1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.) He comforts them on the occasion of the death of their friends, with the assurance that God will restore them, body and soul, at the resurrection—which implies personal recognition. (1 Thess. iv. 13–18.) So Christ comforts his disciples with the promise that though he was going to leave them, he would come again and receive them unto himself, that where he is, there they may be also. (John xiv. 1–3.) How could they thus be restored to him and one another, and not have a mutual recognition? The notion is preposterous. How can we sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God—feasting together in Paradise—and yet not know with whom we are associated? The rich man is represented as knowing "father Abraham"—though the one was in heaven and the other in hell—and yet, forsooth, Lazarus did not know Abraham, though lying in his bosom! Beneficiaries will receive their benefactors into everlasting habitations, but neither will know the other! Those who have converted

sinners from the error of their ways, and conducted them to heaven, will not know them, nor be known by them, when there! All the thoughts, words, and deeds of every saint in heaven will be proclaimed, and every one shall be rewarded according to his character and conduct, and yet no one will know who is meant in any instance—all will be as abstract as algebraic signs! I shall not know my primogenitor, nor the first martyr, nor Enoch, who was translated, nor the second father of the world, nor the great father of the faithful (though I shall be in his bosom), nor Moses or Elijah (though they both seem to have been made known to the disciples "in the holy mount"), nor Isaiah, nor any other prophet, nor John, who was greater than any of them, nor the Virgin Mother, nor Peter or Paul or any other apostle or evangelist, nor Polycarp or any other of the noble army of martyrs, nor Chrysostom or any other of the fathers, nor Luther or any other of the reformers, nor Wesley, or Watts, or any other of those blessed men whose sermons and songs have edified and cheered me in the hours of my pilgrimage, nor

father, mother, sister, brother, daughter or son, pastor or friend; but enough—the *reductio ad absurdum* is carried far enough. Nay, verily —we shall know even as we are known. And those who labor under the infirmity of forgetting names and features here on earth may comfort themselves with the reasonable expectation of never forgetting a name or a face of saint or angel in heaven! What an accession to the happiness of the redeemed! Even Cicero exulted in this glorious prospect in his immortal *De Senectute*—at least he put the glowing sentiment into the mouth of his *Cato Major!*

§ 7. The Beatific Vision.

Then there is the Beatific Vision. We need not revive the old controversy in regard to the *Visio Beatifica*—whether we shall behold God with the eyes of our glorified body, or by a mental vision, with the eyes of our understanding. From the Scripture it would seem that God is ἀόρατος, invisible to the material eye, however it might be clarified in the process of glorification. (John i. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 16; 1 John iv. 12.) But we shall have such a knowledge of God as will be infinitely satisfying to the soul. "As for me I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." (Ps. xvii. 15;

365

cf. Ps. xxvii. 4; Matt. v. 8; Heb. xii. 14.)[1] To be permitted to stand in the presence of an Oriental sovereign and to see his face was considered the highest honor and the greatest felicity—so we shall be admitted into God's presence and shall enjoy the most intimate friendship with him, and this is, at least in part, what we mean by the beatific vision. (Matt. xviii. 12; Luke i. 19.)

> That great mysterious Deity
> We soon with open face shall see;
> The beatific sight
> Shall fill the heavenly courts with praise,
> And wide diffuse the golden blaze
> Of everlasting light.

But the Beatific Vision comprises also the sight of the glorified Humanity of Christ. We shall certainly see him with the eyes of our glorified bodies. Of this Christ assures us. (John xiv.; xvii.; 2 Cor. iv.

6; Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; 1 John iii. 2, 3.)

The angels are represented as charmed with this unique and glorious spectacle. He was "seen of angels" at his birth, during his ministry, at his death, resurrection, and ascension—and we may be well assured they have never grown tired of that beatific sight! He is the cynosure of every eye.

But it needs no argument or revelation to prove that the sight of Jesus will be more transporting to saints than to angels, who never tasted his redeeming grace, or felt his dying love! This is the special privilege of sinners of a mortal race.

But their greatest happiness,
Their highest joy, shall be

366

God their Saviour to possess,
To know, and love, and see.

§ 8. Eternal Progression.

The last thing to be noticed is eternal progression. There will be no retrograde movement in heaven. There will be no stagnation there. All will be life, activity, progress—everlasting progress to higher degrees of glory and bliss.

Eternal possession is the perfection of God, and eternal progression is the perfection of angels and men. We possess faculties which are capable of indefinite expansion and development; there will be infinite space in which to evolve, and infinite duration for the evolution. The perfections and works and ways of God are infinite, and in him we shall live and move and have our being "as long as God shall live." As there are different degrees in glory and blessedness, all will be advancing from stage to stage, while those who are foremost in the eternal march will be foremost to all eternity. This is an animating thought to those who have "supplied" every virtue through a long life of service and suffering, to have "supplied," ministered, unto them abundantly an entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—that is to say, *a triumph*, compared with which ordinary Christians will have but an ovation, and others a bare admission. Yet it is encouraging to these last—such as infants,

idiots, invincibly ignorant persons, and the like. Augustin and others after him, such as the papists, relegate all unbaptized persons, including children, to the doleful regions of the lost. Calvin and others after him relegate all the non-elect, infants and adults, and all heathens to hell.

But we hold, on the authority of reason and revelation, that all who die in infancy, baptized or not baptized; all idiots, and invincibly ignorant persons, who live up to their little light as well as we live up to our greater light, will be saved. It is a probable opinion that God will allow all to enter through the gates into the city who are not willful, incorrigible sinners—all who would be disposed to love and serve the Saviour, if they were made acquainted with him—all who would not offend or do iniquity if admitted into the kingdom. (Matt. xiii. 41). And surely there is not a generous angel or saint in heaven who would grudge them a low degree in glory, and the privilege of growing in knowledge and love and joy. How rapidly will their implicit faith grow

into explicit faith. “Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed!” Thousands have the germ of faith, the disposition which would in favorable circumstances be developed into explicit faith—faith which would work by love, and purify the heart. They are like flowers planted in the frozen zone, which never can display their sweets or their silken leaves unfold; but transplant them into a more genial sphere, in richer soil, with kindlier skies, and then how readily they will take root and grow, and uphold their lovely petals and exhale their delicious fragrance. Jesus will see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied in the salvation of those less favored ones of earth, as well as in that of those to whom providence and grace assigned a better lot on earth. It is the most sublime, the most ravishing spectacle which can arise to our faith and imagination—millions upon millions of unfallen angels—a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues of our redeemed earth, moving around and around, and onward and upward, in everlasting perihelion—in concentric orbits, circling the great central orb, that is so near every one of them that they are ever in his penumbra, and yet at so infinite a distance from him that the space between cannot be compassed through all eternity.

As we can form no conception of the size, form, and features of

the glorified body, it seems vain to inquire whether or not infants will retain their diminutive size—whether or not in this sense "A babe in glory is a babe forever." We may reasonably imagine that the body of an infant will be so developed as to be of service to the glorified spirit; but whether instantaneously at the resurrection, or gradually afterward, it will reach its ultimate growth, we can only conjecture. Perhaps, even in the size of the glorified body, as well as in the expansion of the glorified spirit, there will be forever a distinction between one who dies in infancy and one who reaches maturity before death—though both will progress in knowledge, love, and blessedness to all eternity. Whatever changes in the glorified body will be necessary to correspond with the eternal development of the spirit, we may well imagine, will certainly take place, but we know not what we shall be, and here we end our quest.

---

1. Justin Martyr ("Dialogue with Trypho"), among some nebulous notions, says some good things on this subject. Rehearsing a conversation he had with a Christian philosopher, he says:

   The Deity is not to be viewed by the organs of sight, like other creatures, but he is to be comprehended by the mind alone, as Plato declares, and I believe him. "Have our minds then," he asked, "any power of such nature and extent as can conceive that which has not first been communicated to them by the senses? Or will the mind of man ever see God, if it be not instructed by the Holy Spirit?" "Plato tells us," I answered, "that the eye of the mind is of such a nature, and was given us to such an end, as to enable us to see with it by itself, when pure, that very Being who is the source of whatever is an object of the mind itself—who has neither color, nor shape, nor size, nor any thing which the eye can see, but who is above all essence, who is ineffable and undefinable, who is alone beautiful and good, and who is at once implanted into those souls who are naturally well born through their relationship to and desire of seeing him." The sage asks, "Does the soul see God while it is in the body, or when it is delivered from it?" Justin answers, "Even while it is in a human form it is able to rest upon God through its mind, but especially when freed from the body and existing by itself, does it possess that which it loved wholly and forever."↩

Chapter V. Eternal Punishment.

§ 1. Terms Rendered Hell in the Authorized Version.

368

The word hell comes from the Saxon *helan*, to cover, and means a covered or invisible place, as the grave which conceals the body, and the world beyond the grave which conceals the disembodied spirit, the invisible world. So the German *Hölle* is derived from *Höhle*, a hollow place; as *sheol*, by Gesenius and others, is derived from *shal*, to hollow out, to make a cavern, or burrow. *Sheol*, however, is usually derived from *shaal* to ask or demand—as *Orcus rapax*—the rapacious grave, "insatiate archer," all-devouring death. In our version of the Bible hell represents four terms—one Hebrew, *Sheol*, and three Greek, *Hades, Gehenna,* and *Tartaros.*

Sheol occurs sixty-five times. In sixty-one places it is rendered in the Septuagint, *Hades*—twice *Thanatos* (death), 2 Sam. xxii. 6; Prov. xxiii. 14: in two places. Job xxiv. 19, Ezek. xxxii. 21, it is omitted in the Septuagint. In the Vulgate it is rendered forty-eight times by *Infernus*, and seventeen times by *Inferus* and the plural *Inferi*. In the English Authorized Version it is rendered thirty-one times by "Hell," thirty-one times by "Grave," and three times by "Pit." (Num. xvi. 30–33; Job xvii. 16.)

As the Hebrew *keber* denotes a grave, many contend that *sheol* never does. *Sheol* may not properly mean a literal tomb, or sepulcher, as *keber* does; yet *keber* is sometimes used in a general sense for the place in which a corpse is laid, as Job xvii. 1: "The graves are ready for me"—*i. e.*, "the grave-yard awaits me." *Sheol* is frequently used in the same sense, as when Jacob said he should go down to *sheol* to his son Joseph, who he supposed was not buried in a literal grave, but devoured by a wild beast. So "the grave and gate of death" in the Collect for Easter Eve means the state of the dead—referring to the body, not to the disembodied spirit.

369

The Hebrew *shachath* is frequently rendered "pit," as synonymous with *sheol*, as in Ps. xvi. 10: "Thou wilt not leave my soul—that is my life, put poetically for *me*—in *sheol*—that is, the grave, or state

of death; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one—or *me*—to see corruption"—*shachath*. So Ps. xxx. 9: "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit—*shachath*—shall the dust praise thee?" Here, of course, is no reference to the spirit. So Ps. ix. 15, 17: "The heathen are sunk down in the pit which they made"—*shachath*. "The wicked shall be turned into hell—*sheol*—and all the nations that forget God"—that is, those who oppose the theocracy shall be swept from the earth. The Psalmist thus expresses it in Ps. lxiii. 9, 10: "But those that seek my soul to destroy it shall go down into the lower parts of the earth"—that is, into *sheol*, the grave, poetically considered. "They shall fall by the sword, they shall be a portion for foxes." That is, they shall be slain in the battle-field, and be devoured by jackals and hyenas, which beasts of prey are hardly to be found in the world of spirits! When the Psalmist says: "In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" (Ps. vi. 5)—the one clause explains the other; "death" is the same as "the grave," *sheol*—the condition of the dead—referring to this world, not to the world of spirits.

So "the gates of death" (Job xxxviii. 17; Ps. ix. 13; cvii. 18) are the same as "the gates of hell," *sheol*, *hades* (Heb and LXX.) In Isa. xxxviii. 10, 11, our version renders, "I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave: I am deprived of the residue of my years. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living: I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world." That is, Hezekiah thought he was going to die. So when our Lord promised immortality to the Church, he said: "The gates of hell—*hades*—shall not prevail against it"—that is, it shall never die, shall never be extinct; it shall remain to the end of time, till the militant Church shall be consummated in the Church triumphant.

So Ps. lxxxix. 48: "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul"—his life—himself—"from the hand of the grave?" (Heb. *sheol*; LXX. *hades*.) In Ps. lxxxviii. 10, when it is asked, "Wilt thou shew wonders to

the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee?" the Psalmist has no reference to the spirit in a disembodied state, or to the resurrection of the dead at the last day. He explains himself in the next verse: "Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave?—*keber*—or thy faithfulness in destruction?"—*abaddon*—called in verse 12, "the

dark," "the land of forgetfulness."

Dr. Dwight made an unaccountable mistake when he rendered Eccl. ix. 10: "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, *in the world of spirits*, whither thou goest." The Preacher is contrasting the living with the dead: the work of life is to be done while life lasts. The commentary is found in our Lord's language, John ix. 4: "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work." Our translators properly render, "in the grave whither thou goest," understanding *sheol*, grave, in the sense already explained. As we say popularly, we are all going to the grave, "the house appointed for all living." (Job xxx. 23.)

It is absurd to argue from such passages that the Hebrews did not believe in any state of conscious existence after death; all they intended was what we intend in the use of such expressions—so frequent in rhetorical and poetical language—that so far as this world is concerned those who are dead have "no more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun." It is absurd to object that everybody knows that a buried corpse has no knowledge and no power to act. Everybody knows that every body must die, yet it is not inexpedient to repeat the trite saying, "The living know that they shall die." (Eccl. ix. 5.)

After all the learned criticism which has been spent on *Sheol* (LXX. *Hades*), and the labored efforts to show that, like the *Hades* and *Orcus* of the heathen poets, it sometimes means the under world of spirits, good and bad, it does not appear that a single passage has been adduced which certainly sustains that position. Whitby has carefully examined every passage, and affirms, "That *sheol* throughout the Old Testament, and *hades* in the Septuagint answering to it, signify not the place of punishment, or of the souls of bad men only, but the grave only, or the place of death." (See his learned notes on Acts ii.)

Hades occurs eleven times in the New Testament. Some MSS. and versions, indeed, have *thanate*, "death," instead of *hades*, "grave," in 1 Cor. xv. 55; but this is obviously a mistake. Some

of the Fathers and others probably substituted it as of the same meaning. It is a quotation from Hosea xiii. 14, where the Hebrew has *sheol*, and the Septuagint *hades*. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave—*sheol*, *hades*—I will redeem them from death: O

death, I will be thy plagues; O grave—*sheol*, *hades*—I will be thy destruction." The scope of the apostle's argument—in his discourse on the resurrection of the body—shows that he refers exclusively to the grave, or state of the dead. Death, being personified, is conquered in the resurrection—so the grave.

In four places of the Apocalypse, which uses the prophetic style (Rev. i. 18; vi. 8; xx. 13, 14), "Death and Hell" (*hades*) are associated together in the same way—both being personified—as being under the power of Him who hath abolished death by his own resurrection, and will utterly despoil death and the grave in the resurrection of the dead at the last day.

In Acts ii. 27, 31, as we have seen, *hades*, "hell," *diaphthora*, "corruption," correspond to *sheol* and *shachath*—referring to the body in the grave or state of death, and not to the spirit in the disembodied state. (*Cf.* Acts xiii. 34–37.)

In Matt. xvi. 18, as we have seen, "the gates of *hades*" is a poetic expression for death.

In Matt. xi. 23 and Luke x. 15, "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell"—*hades*—there is no more reference to the place of disembodied spirits, or of the punishment of body and soul in a future state, in the second clause, than there is to the place of happiness in the future state in the first clause. It simply means that the then flourishing city should be utterly destroyed—become invisible, as if, like many other cities of antiquity, it were buried out of sight—which indeed has been its fate, as no one can certainly tell where it stood.

In Luke xvi. 23 it is said the rich man lifted up his eyes in *hades*, being in torment. But the language is parabolical, the images being all corporeal and physical—fire, water, tongue, finger—and a chasm dividing, one part of the region from another. Our Lord may have had in view the notions which the later Jews borrowed from the Greeks, about the Elysian Fields and Tartarus in Hades, which they considered the land of shades. The translation of the Vulgate, followed by Wycliffe and other

versions, is this: "The rich man also died, and he was buried in hell"—*in inferno.* Could the translator have meant the same as *descendit ad inferna*—the interpolated clause in the Creed, meaning he was buried in the grave? If Dr. A. Clarke had considered this perhaps he would not have written this note:

But what a difference in these burials, if we take in the reading of my old MS. Bible, which is supported by several versions: "Forsothe the riche man is dead, and is buried in helle." And this is also the reading of the Anglo-Saxon: "and was in hell buried." In some MSS. the point has been wanting after ἐταφη, he was buried; and the following καί, *and*, removed and set before ἐταρας, *he lifted up*, so that the passage reads thus: "The rich man died also, and was buried in hell, and lifting up his eyes, being in torment, he saw," etc.

Bishop Pearson says:

Descendit in inferna, or *ad inferna*, is the general writing in the ancient MSS.—not in the express and formal term of *hell*, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude—some translating *inferna* "hell," others, "the lower parts." . . . Since that it is *descendit ad inferos*, or *descendit ad inferum*. *Inferi* is most frequently used for the place under ground where the souls departed are, and the *inferna* must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations. And so *descendit ad inferna* and *descendit ad inferos* are the same.

Infernum is the place occupied by the *inferi*—those below—whether the reference is to the shades in Orcus, according to the heathen notion, or to the dead lying in the grave, according to the Hebrew Scriptures.

In Isaiah xiv. 9–11 the King of Babylon is thus apostrophized: "Hell—*Sheol*, *Hades*, on the margin, the grave—from beneath is moved to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." Hardly in the land of disembodied spirits! So in Ezek. xxxi., xxxii., Egypt, Assyria, Elam, Meshech, Tubal, Edom, the Zidonians, and other nations are represented as conquered and subdued, brought down to hell—*sheol*, *hades*—with their weapons of war under them, all lying in the grave—here repeatedly called "the pit"—Hebrew *bor*, Septuagint *bothron*, which means a pit, a cistern, a sepulcher—"of frequent occurrence," says Gesenius, "in the phrases, 'those who go down to the sepulcher,' *i. e.*, the dead (Ps. xxviii. 1; xxx. 4; lxxxviii. 5;

Isa. xxxviii. 18; xiv. 19); 'those who are to go to the stones of the

sepulcher,' *i. e.*, to be buried in the more costly sepulchers of stone —*ad bor*, 'unto the sepulcher' (Pro v. xxviii. 17; Isa. xiv. 15); 'the recesses of the sepulcher,' *i. e.*, the lowest sepulcher." Is it not quite as likely that our Lord had his eye upon these sepulchral passages, as upon Greek and Jewish mythologies, a *hades* in the other world, of which the Old Testament is silent? The corporeal imagery is so obvious that Theophylact and Whitby project the parable into the post-resurrection state. But this is alike untenable and unnecessary. The parable is a vivid way of representing the divine and unalterable condition of the good and the bad after death, corresponding with their character in the present life. What a world of impertinent and farfetched learning and fruitless controversy has been wasted on this plain but tremendously significant parable!

The Greek *Gehenna* occurs twelve times in the New Testament. It is always transferred in the Vulgate, and it would have been well perhaps if our English translators had followed the Vulgate in this; but they have from Wycliffe to the Authorized Version rendered it "hell." Rotherham transfers the word *gehenna*. The Greek word γέεννα is from the Hebrew *Gai Hinnom*, the Valley of Hinnom (Josh. xv. 8), the narrow valley skirting Jerusalem on the south, running down from the west into the Valley of Jehoshaphat, under Mount Zion. Here the ancient Israelites burned their infants in fire to Moloch. (2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 31, 32; xxxii. 35.) Hence probably it was called Tophet, the place of burning. It is said that fires were kept burning there in after times to consume the offal of the city, carcasses of beasts, and bodies of great criminals who were sentenced to be thus degraded after their execution. It was therefore called, says Gesenius, the "place of burning (the dead), and even *place of graves*." *Hades* was the place where bodies were buried—*Gehenna* the place where they were burned—though afterward the valley became literally a place of graves. (Jer. vii. 31–33).

Isaiah thus alludes to it in the startling figurative language with which he closes his prophecy: "And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth"—that is from Jerusalem to Gehenna—"and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed

against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

In Matt. v. 22 it seems to denote the greatest punishment for the greatest crime—to be burned either alive, or after execution by stoning, in this horrible valley—"the gehenna of fire." So in Matt. v. 29, 30 our Lord uses this proverbial language: It is better to lose one of thy members than thy whole body in Gehenna. (*Cf.* xviii. 9.) So Mark ix. 43, 45, 47.

It is used figuratively in Matt. x. 28; and in Luke xii. 5. "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in *Gehenna*." Here it is used just as the word death is used—the death of the body and the death of the soul—irretrievable destruction after temporal death. It is pushing the metaphor too far to make it teach annihilation. The worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. "A son of Gehenna" (Matt. xxiii. 14) is one deserving to be burned in Gehenna—in English idiom, one who deserves to be hanged. The tongue "set on fire by Gehenna" (James iii. 6) is one that inflames society by slander and blasphemy—a raging, unquenchable fire. "The judgment of the Gehenna" refers to the sentence on criminals condemned to be burned in Gehenna.

This metaphorical language may, of course, be used in reference to severe punishments, either in this world or the world to come—and so, as we have seen, it is used in the New Testament. It is hardly proper therefore to define the word, as Robinson does, "*Gehenna, Hell—i. e.*, the place of punishment in Hades or the world of the dead, viz., *Tartarus*, 2 Pet. ii. 4; Rev. xx. 14, 15; Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 7; *cf.* Judith xvi. 17; Eccl. vii. 17." But it is evident that Gehenna, and Sodom and Gomorrah, furnished the metaphors thus employed to set forth the vengeance of eternal fire, spoken of in these passages.

The only other place in which "hell" occurs is 2 Pet. ii. 4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment, the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." Rotherham renders "consigning to the lowest *hades*, to pits of gloom delivered them up, to be kept for judgment." Robinson says, "to thrust down to Tartarus, to cast into Gehenna." But as it refers to the rebel angels,

and not to men with bodies as well as souls, perhaps the apostle, writing to those who were familiar with Greek mythology,

borrowed the word, which denotes the lowest part of the heathen *hades*, in which the wicked were confined. The fallen angels are there confined, as in a prison, awaiting the grand assize, when they shall receive their final doom. The apostle says in like manner unjust men will be confined till they also receive their doom in the day of judgment. The word *tartarus* is not used, but the cognate verb—*i. e.*, they are *tartared*[1]—consigned to *tartarus*.

When Canon Farrar takes advantage of this to favor his view of the finite punishment of wicked men, we admit that the verb does not mean to cast into hell, as is popularly understood; but for all that appears to the contrary wicked men after death may be confined with those wicked spirits, as both will be punished together in the eternal state. "Depart from me, ye cursed [men] into the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," (Matt. xxv. 41; *cf.* 46.)

The result of our inquiry into the meaning of the words in question, *Sheol*, *Hades, Gehenna*, and *Tartarus*, is, that while none of these words are proper names of the place of punishment for the wicked in another world, yet they all may be so figuratively applied, as Gehenna is, to that of wicked men, and Tartarus (or the cognate verb) to that of wicked angels; particularly as we speak of future punishment under the idea and by the formula of the second death. (Rev. xx.)

It may be proper—indeed it is necessary—to note other terms used in the Scriptures in setting forth future punishment.

§ 2. The Terms Rendered Damn—Damnation—Damnable.

Canon Farrar says: "The verb 'to damn' in the Greek Testament is neither more nor less than the verb 'to condemn,' and the word translated 'damnation,' or rather the two words, are simply the words which, in the vast majority of instances, the very same translators have translated, and rightly translated, by 'judgment' and 'condemnation.'"

It is not easy to see the force of this remark. "Damnation" sometimes does mean "judgment," or "condemnation." But the Canon seems to have forgotten that there are three words rendered "damnation" in the Authorized Version. Surely ἀπώγεια does not

mean judgment or condemnation. It occurs twenty times in the New Testament. Twice it is rendered *waste*. Five times it is rendered *destruction—e. g.*, "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction." (Matt. vii. 12.) "Vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." (Rom. ix. 22.) "Bring upon themselves swift destruction." (2 Pet. ii. 1.) "Which they wrest unto their own destruction." (2 Pet. iii. 16.) "Whose end is destruction." (Phil. iii. 19.) Sometimes it is rendered "perdition," as "the son of perdition." (John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3.) (See Phil. i. 28; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Heb. x. 39; 2 Pet. iii. 7; Rev. xvii. 8–11.) It is rendered "pernicious ways" in 2 Pet. ii. 2; "perish," Acts viii. 20; and "die," Acts xxv. 16. In 2 Pet. ii. 1, it is "*damnable* heresies"—heresies of damnation—those which lead to perdition—the loss of the soul. In 2 Pet. ii 3: "their *damnation* slumbereth not"—they are hastening to perdition—utter ruin.

A second word, κρίσις, occurs forty-eight times—rendered "accusation" twice, "condemnation" twice, forty-one times "judgment," three times "damnation," to wit: Matt. xxiii. 33; Mark iii. 29, "eternal damnation;" John v. 29, "the resurrection of damnation"—where the judgment involves the consequent punishment, or is put for it. The correspondent verb, κρίνω, is used once in the same way, "that they all might be *damned*." (2 Thess. ii. 12.)

A third term, κρῖμα, from the same verb, means judgment, or the act of judging, or the judgment rendered, the decision, or award, and occurs twenty-eight times—in six places it is rendered "damnation"—*e. g.*, Matt. xxiii. 14 (13); Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47: "Ye shall receive the greater damnation." Rom. iii. 8: "whose damnation is just." Rom. xiii. 2: "shall receive to themselves damnation." 1 Tim. v. 12: "having damnation"—incurring condemnation, liability to punishment for their apostasy.

The compound verb, κατακρίνω, means to give judgment against, to condemn. It occurs nineteen times, and is rendered "condemn" in seventeen places, and "damn" in two—*e. g.*, "he that believeth not shall be damned." "He that doubteth is damned."

(Rom. xiv. 23.) The correspondent noun, κατακριμα, occurs three times, and is always properly rendered "condemnation." But what does condemnation mean? It is "the judicial act of declaring guilty and dooming to punishment." That is precisely the theological idea of damnation; "the Lord, the righteous judge," in "the day of

judgment and perdition of ungodly men," pronounces the sentence, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." That is what the apostle cites as "the eternal judgment," since there is no court of appeals to reverse the decision, and no power to prevent the execution of the sentence.

§ 3. The Terms Rendered Eternity—Everlasting—Eternal.

The Hebrew *olam* is usually rendered by the Greek *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, and Latin *aeternitas, aeternus*—English eternity, eternal, everlasting. (Dan. xii. 2.) These words sometimes denote duration without beginning or end; sometimes duration without beginning; sometimes duration without end; sometimes duration indefinite; sometimes duration definite, as a particular cycle of time.

Αἰών occurs, we believe, one hundred and twenty-two times in the New Testament; and *αἰώνιος* seventy-one times. Αἰών occurs about four hundred times in the LXX., and *αἰώνιος* over one hundred. Αἰώνιος is well represented by our Latin-English word *Eternal*—which, strange as it may seem, originated in *αἰών*—and our Saxon-English *Everlasting*—which have the same meaning. Matt. xxv. 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment [*αἰώνιος*]; but the righteous into life eternal [*αἰώνιος*]."

When any restriction of the meaning of *olam* or *αἰώνιος* is called for, it is apparent from the context—as, "I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee, the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." (Gen. xvii. 8.) So we read of "the everlasting hills," etc. Canon Farrar says, in his unfortunate sermon on "Eternal Punishment," "the word *αἰώνιος*, translated 'everlasting' is simply the word, which in its first sense means 'age-long,' and it is, in the Bible itself, applied over and over again to things which have utterly and long since passed away; and, in its second sense, it is something above and beyond time—something spiritual, as when the knowledge of God is said to be eternal life."

The Canon seems to have his eye on the notion of De Quincy and others that *αἰώνιος*, in the connections specified, refers to quality and not to duration. The truth is, it refers to quality only as it refers to duration. The spiritual life of the saint is an *aionian* life because, if he does not forfeit it by sin, it will never cease, but will be "most

vigorous when the body dies." So the spiritual death of the sinner is an *aionian* death, because if not repented of in time it will continue through eternity. These words are used to set forth the unlimited duration of God's existence (Rom. xvi. 26; Heb. ix. 14; Gen. xxi. 33; Isa. xi. 28); and of the life of the blessed in heaven, and in the same verse of the punishment of the wicked. (Matt. xxv. 46.)

If there be any passages which limit the meaning of those terms when they are used of future retribution, let them be adduced: the burden of proof is not on us.

We do not refer to the Fathers to settle any dogmatic question; but we may refer to them to illustrate the use of particular terms in the Greek language, which they used as their vernacular. Justin Martyr lived in the age succeeding that of the apostles, and he wrote in their Hellenistic idiom.

In Apology I. 8 he says: "Plato said that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the wicked when they came to them: we say the same thing will take place; but that the Judge will be Christ, and that their souls will be united to the same bodies, aud will undergo an *aionian*, eternal, punishment; and not, as he said, a period of a thousand years only." Here he uses the very words of Matt. xxv. 46, αἰώνίαν κόλασιν, and contrasts that *aionian* punishment with that of Plato, a thousand years only. Universalists say that all punishment in the future state is *aionian*; how then can Justin contrast Plato's thousand years' punishment with that which Christ inflicts, and which is distinguished from the former by the epithet *aionian*? This must designate duration, and what can that be but endless as contrasted with Plato's thousand years? Immediately before he speaks of a life of eternal duration and purity—using the same word, αἰωνίου.

In I. 12 he says: "Every one is advancing either to eternal punishment or to salvation, according to the quality of his actions; for if all were aware of this, no man would be found to prefer sin for a season, knowing that he was passing to eternal

condemnation through fire." Here the same word is used, and it refers to both "punishment" and "salvation"—just as αἰώνιον in Matt. xxv. 46 refers to both "punishment"—κόλασιν—and "life." So Justin employs "eternal condemnation"—αἰώνίαν.

In I. 28 Justin says: "Satan will be sent into fire with his host, and the men who are his followers, therefore to be tormented to the

endless eternity—the unlimited *aion*—τόν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα—which Christ foretold"—alluding to Matt. xxv. 41, 46.

In I. 52 he says: "Christ shall raise up the bodies of all men that have been, and clothe them with incorruptibility; but shall send those of the wicked, with the evil spirits, into the eternal suffering of eternal fire." Compare this with sec. 20, where he says: "The souls of the wicked are punished, and are in a state of suffering after death"—ἐν αἰσθήσει, suffering, or sensation, as in sec. 52.

He uses the same word, αἴσθησις, in sec. 18: "For look back to the end of each of the emperors, how they died the death which is common to all men, which if it terminated in insensibility—ἀναισθησίαν (whence our word *anesthetics*)—would be a godsend to all the wicked; but since sensation, αἴσθησις, remains in all men who have been in existence, and everlasting punishment—κόλασιν αἰωνία—is in store, do not hesitate to believe, and be convinced that what I say is true." Justin, it appears, was no Universalist or Restorationist, whether or not he was a Destructionist. In sec. 44 he speaks of the "immortality of the soul," and "punishments after death." These he repeatedly states are *aionian*, by which he seems to mean absolutely endless. In his "Dialogue with Tryphon," indeed, he represents his preceptor as saying, "The soul cannot be termed immortal." But he simply means that as it is not naturally "ingenerate," that is, unbegotten or uncreated, so it is not naturally immortal or self-existent. Justin agreed with Titian, who held that "the soul is not of its own nature immortal, but yet it does not die." It is not absolutely incapable of destruction, which can be predicated alone of Him whose existence is necessary and without origination—as Paul says, "God alone has immortality." (1 Tim. vi. 16.) Justin says, as translated in the Oxford edition and others: "But at the same time I affirm that souls never perish, for this would indeed be a godsend to the wicked. What then befalls them? The souls of the good

are consigned to a better place, and those of the evil and unjust to a worse, there to await the day of judgment. Thus such as are worthy to see God die no more, but others shall undergo punishment as long as it may please him that they shall exist and be punished." It is proper to observe that the ambiguous clause, Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ, is rendered by others, "But I affirm that all souls do not die"—which agrees with the

grammatical structure of the passage; but this does not materially affect the general meaning, because it refers to the time of death, not to the day of judgment in the post-resurrection state. When he says that they will exist and be punished as long as God wills, he means that they will not exist of themselves, but by the will of God, who could, if he would, reduce them to the nonentity from which he called them. But in sec. 45 he says: "Some shall be sent into the judgment and condemnation of the eternal fire to be tormented; but the others shall live together free from suffering and corruption and sorrow, and in immortality."

Mr. Drew says, "According to the present laws of nature, and our means of knowing them, annihilation must be impossible;" yet he says, "While I assert annihilation to be impossible, I would by no means insinuate that annihilation is not within the reach of Omnipotent Power." He argues that nothing else *can* annihilate the soul, and that God *will not*.

It must be so—Plato, thou reason'st well—
Else whence this pleasing life, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?
Or whence this secret dread and inward horror
Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis heaven that points out an hereafter,
And intimates Eternity to man.
Eternity! thou pleasing, dreadful thought
Through what variety of untried being,
Through what new scenes and changes must we pass!
The wide, th' unbounded prospect lies before me;
But shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it.
The soul, secured in her existence, smiles
At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.
The stars shall fade away, the sun himself
Grow dim with age, and Nature sink in years.
But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,

Unhurt amid the war of elements,
The wreck of matter, and the crash of worlds.

Mr. Drew remarks, "Wherever moral evil has not transmuted

hope into despair, from a consciousness of future punishment, there is, in every human mind, an insatiable desire after the greatest degree of possible happiness, which, embracing perpetuity, certainly includes the idea of immortality. The same mode of reasoning which can deduce immortality from hope can gather it from despair. The same physical principle is alike active at the bottom—it is moral evil, by annihilating hope, that unlocks the avenues of despair."[2]

We do not mean to assert that none of the Fathers were Destructionists—some of them seem to have been—nor that none of them were Restorationists, as Origen and some of his followers were. The eschatology of the ante-Nicene Fathers, as well as their soteriology, was vague and confused. But patristic views soon crystallized into orthodoxy, as we understand it. But there is one heterodox notion which we may briefly notice.

The Trustees of the Fernley Lectures engaged the Rev. G. W. Olver to deliver the lecture for 1878, during the session of the Wesleyan Conference at Bradford, July 22. They chose his subject: "Life and Death—the Sanctions of the Law of Love." The subject was well chosen, in view of the trilateral controversy raging between the Orthodox, the Conditionalists, and the Universalists. Whether or not Mr. Olver's views will make the controversy quadrilateral remains to be seen.

Mr. Giver maintains, against the Universalists, the orthodox view, that some men will be lost forever—they cut themselves off, without remedy, from the Source of life; and against Conditionalists that "Cutting himself off from God, in his selfish isolation, the sinner, as to his soul, dies Godward, and the death of the body, but completes his separation from his fellows—this is not annihilation." No, it is not annihilation; but the Conditionalists say that it is, though they have never proved it.

But here comes Mr. Giver's peculiar view: "We read much about society in heaven, but not much about society in hell. The only life of the wicked being bodily life, the only death they can die is bodily death. Their departure into everlasting fire destroys again the body, for which there is no more resurrection.

This is the second death, and makes complete and eternal that separation from the fellowship of man which, together with separation from the fellowship of God, constitutes the penalty of

sin. There is no spiritual body for the sinner."

Whitby, in his elaborate argument against the annihilation of the souls of the wicked (Appendix to 2 Thess. i.), says: "I conjecture that this fire may be called eternal, not that the bodies of the wicked shall be forever burning in it, and never be consumed by it, since this cannot be done without a constant miracle; but because it shall so entirely consume their bodies as that they never shall subsist again, but shall perish and be destroyed forever by it. In which sense Sodom and Gomorrah were set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire—these I call my conjectures, or my private sentiments." Some may suggest that he was under no obligation to make them public.

It is to be apprehended that the Conditionalists, or Annihilationists, will make a sinister use of this.

The fire of hell is either literal or figurative. Mr. Olver says: "Fire is the chosen symbol of the God of love, because it aptly represents an eternal fact in God's unchanging nature, the wrath of love against sin."

Then the fire is figurative—it is not literal, composed of oxygen and carbon, which has the power of disintegrating, not annihilating, material substances—but which has no power over a spiritual essence. But is the fire of hell of that character? Christ represents the Judge as saying to the wicked at the last day, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. xxv. 41.) The devil and his angels surely have no bodies to be destroyed, burned up, in a literal fire!

Again, Christ says: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"—*gehenna*. (Matt. x. 28.) Here the same action of the fire of *gehenna* takes place on the soul as well as on the body—both are destroyed by it. If the body be destroyed by a literal combustion, the soul must in like manner be consumed. As a soul it ceases to be just like the body.

How literal fire can act on the soul—how it can disintegrate a spiritual essence, Destructionists have never yet informed us.

Mr. Olver says: "There is no spiritual body for the sinner."

Does he mean to say that in the general resurrection the bodies of the wicked will be raised with the organs and functions they possessed before death? Such a gross conception might pass in St.

Augustine's day (see his "City of God"), but surely no one in our time adopts it.

They will be raised—no question about that. "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth—they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 28, 29; Acts xxiv. 15; Rev. xx. 12–15.)

Destructionists admit that the bodies of the wicked live for awhile after the resurrection; some of them say they will live a long time before they will be annihilated; but surely they will not live under their earthly conditions—supported by air, heat, moisture, food, etc., as in the present state! It follows then that they must have a body different from the present—material, indeed, as will be the bodies of the saints—as is the body of Christ—but not "*animal*" (ψυχικός)—it must therefore be *spiritual* (πνευματικός, the opposite of ψυχικός, 1 Cor. xv. 44–46)—adapted to the conditions of the world in which it shall dwell.

As the *pneumatic* body of the righteous will be like the body of Christ, ethereal, sublimated, glorious, it may be thought that there is an incongruity in speaking of the resurrection-body of the wicked as a spiritual or *pneumatic* body; but it may be "spiritual," without being glorious—*spiritual*, as not *animal*—kept in existence by the power of God without the use of food, etc., for the sustentation of life. Thus the wicked will be raised by the power of God, but not by his Spirit, as will be the righteous, in whom the Spirit here resides, and who will dwell in them forever—adapting them to their heavenly state. Thus Whitby on Rom. viii. 11: "God will raise the wicked by his power, not by his Spirit dwelling in them—not as the sons of God, to be made joint heirs with Christ, but as the children of Satan, to be cast into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels—not, lastly, to live a happy life, but to die the second death."

The "destruction" which they will undergo, as we have seen, comprehends both body and soul; if the body be destroyed in the sense of annihilation, the soul will share its fate—and that is what the Conditionalists, or Annihilationists, or Destructionists affirm, and what the Orthodox and the Universalists deny.

384

If the soul be not destroyed, in the sense of annihilation, where is the proof that the body will be? There is none.

The hypothesis in question is not only without any scriptural support, but it has nothing in reason to recommend it. It does not relieve the horrors of eternal retribution, for it leaves the sinner to suffer forever in his soul. It does not admit of the graduation of the penalty, while the Orthodox view allows of degrees in the retribution of the good and the bad, far beyond the general conception. That any of either class will "leave their own habitation," so that any of the saints shall become sinners, or any of the sinners become saints, is nowhere affirmed in the Bible, and we must not be wise above what is written. In what the retributions will consist it has not pleased God to reveal, except in a general way and, for the most part, in figurative terms. We know this much: "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

[Dr. Pope concedes some sound principles to the Annihilationists:

It must be admitted that the theologians of this new school have steadfastly asserted some fundamental principles. They hold fast the doctrine of the eternal punishment of sin; and that of the absolute and inherent claims of the divine righteousness. They do justice, in their manner, to the terrors of the Lord, and vindicate the reality of heavenly wrath against unrepenting and obdurate transgressors. They are among the most determined opponents of the Restitution theory in all its forms: regarding it as their most formidable rival for the suffrages of human mercy and hope. Both these hypotheses set out with the foregone conclusion that every trace of evil must be swept out of the universe: each waiving the consideration that it has existed, and that the same Supreme Will which permitted it to be, may, in his eternal wisdom, suffer it to continue under new conditions. But they are mutually intolerant: each on its own side of the cross of redemption thinks the other a despiser of that cross. The two hypotheses of Extinction and Universalism meet with no such thorough refutation as in the writings of their advocates respectively. The Annihilationists, however, pay a tribute to the divine holiness, and the freedom of the human will, and the essential evil of sin, which their opponents at the other extreme fail to pay. But this is all that can be said.[3]]

---

1. In the Vatican MS. of the LXX.; Job. xl. 15 (20 Eng.) the noun occurs, ἐν τῷ παρτάρῳ, in the tartarus, meaning a low place, as we say in the bottom, as contrasted with the upper land: "Surely the

mountains bring him forth food; where all the beasts of the field play. He liveth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed and fens." It is field in the Heb. and Alex. copy of the LXX. Behemoth lies down in the bottom, near the river, but he goes to the mountains to forage.↩

2. "Immortality of the Human Soul," Sec. 4.↩
3. Pope, "Compendium," etc., Vol. III., p. 442.↩

Book IV. Pneumatology and Subjective Soteriology; or, the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of his Administration of Redemption.

Article IV.
Of the Holy Ghost.

387

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.[1]

1. This article corresponds word for word with Article V. of the Anglican Church.↩

Chapter I. The Procession of the Holy Ghost.

§ 1. Creed Statements.

The article in the Apostles' Creed on the Third Person of the Trinity is very brief: "I believe in the Holy Ghost." This is expanded in the Nicene, or Constantinopolitan, Creed: "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." The Athanasian Creed says, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." The Catechism says, "The Holy Ghost is the third person in the Trinity, equal in power and glory to the Father and the Son."

§ 2. The Name of the Third Person of the Trinity.

The name here given to the Third Person of the Trinity is highly suggestive: "The Holy Ghost." The word "Ghost" comes from the Anglo-Saxon *gast*, spirit, breath, not from *gest*, a guest, or inmate. It is never used in the Old Testament in our translation, in reference to the Third Person of the Trinity, but "Spirit" is always used, even when, as in these places, the epithet "Holy" is prefixed, as "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me" (Ps. li. 11); "They rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit;" "He that put his Holy Spirit within him" (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11). So in Luke xi. 13; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; 1 Thess. iv. 8. It would be awkward to say, "Grieve not the Holy Ghost of God;" or, as in

the Collect for the Sunday after Ascension-day: "Send to us thine Holy Ghost to comfort us." It would be still more awkward to say, "Except a man be born of water and of the *Ghost*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Hence it is always rendered "Spirit," where it has not the prefix. But unfortunately, when it has the prefix, with the exception of the former instances specified—some eighty or ninety times—it is rendered "Holy Ghost." The mere

English reader is led to imagine some difference between *Ghost* and *Spirit*, whereas the word is the same in all cases—viz., πνεῦμα.

This title is well chosen. The word comes from πνέω, to breathe—hence it means breath, wind, air in motion. It thus precisely corresponds to the Hebrew *Ruach*—breath, wind, air in motion. It is applied with admirable propriety to the Third Person of the Trinity, as the all-encompassing and ever-moving atmosphere—viewless, yet powerful—is the appropriate symbol of this Divine Agent. He is everywhere in the moral world as the atmosphere is everywhere in the natural world, except where by some obstacle he is debarred an entrance. As an exhausted receiver excludes the natural element, so a hard, rebellious heart precludes the Spirit's entrance.

The Latin *Spiritus* (whence our word spirit) has precisely the same import. The epithet "Holy" is prefixed because the Spirit is perfectly and absolutely holy in himself, and is the Source of all the holiness in the universe.

§ 3. The Doctrine of the Spirit's Procession.

The article, as well as the so-called Constantinopolitan and Athanasian Creeds, says that he "proceedeth from the Father and the Son."

This is not in the Apostles' Creed, nor in the Creed of the Council of Nice; nor was it indeed in the Creed of the Council of Constantinople. That Council, wishing to oppose the error of the Macedonians, who denied the Divine Personality of the Holy Spirit, developed the Nicene article thus: "And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Life-giver: who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." The Catholic Church agreed upon this symbol, and the Council at Ephesus decreed that it should receive no addition.

But the Latins held that the Spirit proceedeth also from the Son, and the Spanish and French Churches put it into the Creed, and sung it in their Liturgy: "We believe also in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, and the Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son"—*ex Patre Filioque procedentum*.

The question was referred to Pope Leo III., who "absolutely

concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated." Leo also had the Creed, as adopted at Constantinople, engraved on silver plates, one in Greek and another in Latin—never to be altered. But Pope Nicolaus I. inserted *Filioque*—"and the Son." So much for the infallibility and immutability of the Holy See! Photius, in the ninth century, protested against it; and the Eighth General Council (according to the Greeks) declared that the Filioque should be removed. The Greeks continued to protest against the addition, but all in vain; the Latins were obstinate in retaining it, and thus the Church was divided, and will remain so till the word is removed. The Latins contended it should be there, because the doctrine is true; but the Greeks contended that, true or false, the Latins had no right to add to the Creed of the Catholic Church, and besides they did not believe the doctrine, which was never advanced by the Greek Fathers, who held that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father through the Son. As the Reformation took place in the Western Church, and as the Reformers wished to alter or cancel nothing that was not erroneous, they allowed the *Filioque* to remain in the so-called Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed; and hence its place in this Article of the Confession.

For a similar reason Mr. Wesley when he revised the Confession allowed this clause to remain in the article, though he did not insert the so-called Nicene Creed in the Liturgy of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, nor the Athanasian Creed; nor is the procession of the Holy Spirit contained in the Catechism.

§ 4. Procession Defined.

But what is meant by this word *procession*? The schoolmen interpret it by the word *spiration*, which agrees with the word spirit. As God "bringeth forth the wind out of his treasures" (Jer. x. 13), so the breath of God, the Holy Spirit, is breathed forth from the Father and the Son; yet so as not to sever the personal relation between them. Neither Father, Son, nor Spirit

was made or created, being eternal and infinite. The Father in no sense was begotten; but the Son, as the title implies, was begotten—though this is not prejudicial to his essential Deity, as it is by an eternal generation. The Father does not *proceed* in any sense, as he

is the Fountain of the Godhead, and the Son is not said to proceed as by spiration (for he is begotten), but the Spirit is not begotten—he proceeds, spiration being proper to his personality.

§ 5. The Twofold Procession: the Ontological.

Theologians speak of a twofold procession of the Holy Spirit—the ontological and the economical.

The ontological procession refers to the immanent relation of the Spirit to the Father and the Son in the Triune Godhead from all eternity. This is the necessary mode of his being. He was the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son by the necessity of the divine nature. But the mode of the divine existence is confessedly mysterious and incomprehensible. We cannot comprehend the mystery—we can only believe and adore.

Hail, Holy Ghost, Jehovah, third
In order of the Three;
Sprung from the Father and the Word
From all eternity.

§ 6. The Economical Procession.

The economical procession refers to the official relation of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, especially in the economy of redemption.

In the creation of the world the Spirit of God came forth and brooded upon the waters and made them prolific of life, and brought forth the heavens and the earth in all their grandeur and beauty. As in essence he is one with the Father and the Son, so in person he co-operated with them in the work of creation; and in an infinitely higher sense than the heathen imagine he is the “soul of the world.”

So in the new creation. Nothing is effected without his efficacious agency. No sooner was the first promise given to our fallen race than the Holy Spirit began to work upon humanity prospectively redeemed. He was the author and agent of all the good done in the earth from the beginning. Every thing in faith, worship, and morals, in the earlier dispensations as well as the

present dispensation, came from his efficacious influence.

391

Types and prophecies were of his inspiration and appointment. “He spake by the prophets.” All Scripture is given by his inspiration; for the prophets “inquired and searched diligently what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” (1 Pet. i. 10, 11.) It was the Spirit of Christ which influenced Noah to preach to antediluvian sinners, now confined for their disobedience in the prison of perdition. (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20.) “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” (2 Pet. i. 21.)

§ 7. The Spirit’s Relation to Christ’s Earthly Career.

The economical procession of the Holy Spirit has special reference to the work which he performed in the incarnation, ministry, miracles, death, and resurrection of Christ. Thus the Catechism: “He framed the human nature of Christ in the womb of the Virgin, so that he was born without sin; and he gave to him wisdom and grace without measure.” The texts cited for this are the following: Luke i. 35: “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Luke ii. 52: “And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.” Isa. lxi. 1: “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.”

Thy power through Jesus’ life displayed,
Quite from the Virgin’s womb,
Dying, his soul an offering made,
And raised him from the tomb.

In one sense Christ was conceived of or by (for the preposition is the same in the Greek) the Virgin Mary, as she performed the functions of a mother, and “the Word was made,” or assumed,

"flesh" of her substance. But in another sense he "was conceived by the Holy Ghost." He was not made of the substance of the Spirit, "whose essence cannot be made" or communicated—so that the Spirit is not the Father of Christ, in the proper sense—though some of the ancients loosely so speak. He performed

neither the act of creation nor that of generation; but by an incomprehensible miracle superseded human paternity in order that the Offspring of the Virgin might be free from all taint of inherited depravity—his conception being immaculate. We cannot well suppose that the Holy Spirit ever left the Son of God from the time of his conception till he ascended into heaven; but he was specially present with him, and exerted an influence upon him, when at his baptism he descended like a dove and lighted upon him, and when Jesus exercised his ministry and performed his miracles. It was thus predicted: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." (Isa. xi. 2.) "I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." (Isa. xlii. 1; Matt. xii. 18.) "I cast out the devils," says he, "by the Spirit of God." (Matt. xii. 28.) "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." (John iii. 34.) "Christ through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." (Heb. ix. 14.) He was "quickened"—that is, raised from the dead—"by the Spirit." (1 Pet. iii. 18.)

§ 8. The Dispensation of the Spirit.

But all this was only anticipatory of "the dispensation of the Spirit." Though, as we have seen, he has been in the world, as a divine agent in the economy of redemption ever since the primeval promise was given, yet his mission, by eminence, did not commence until the Day of Pentecost, when the New Dispensation was formally inaugurated. Thus John the Baptist: "I indeed baptize you with water—he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matt. iii. 11.) So Christ himself promised the gift of the Spirit under the symbol of living water. "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii. 39.) In

his paschal discourses our Lord repeatedly promises the Holy Spirit to his followers: “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he

dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.” “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” (John xiv. 16, 17, 26.) “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.” (John xv. 26.) “It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you.” (John xvi. 7–15.) In these wonderful passages our Lord clearly shows that the Holy Spirit, in the economical sense, proceedeth from himself as well as from the Father. For though he doth not say, “which proceedeth from the Father *and me*,” because he was then personally present, and spoke of his own agency in the premises as future, yet the language, “I will send unto you from the Father”—“I will send him unto you”—“All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you”—expresses all that we mean by procession in the economical sense, and any controversy on the subject is a fruitless logomachy.

§ 9. The Paraclete.

The peculiar office of the Spirit belongs to the economical procession. He proceeds from the Father and the Son to work out the great scheme of redemption, and is thus that "other Comforter," or *Paraclete*, as the word should be rendered, for whose mission it was "expedient" that Christ should leave the world and return to the Father. It was "expedient," as Christ, in his glorified humanity, has to act as our Advocate with the Father—"our

Friend before the throne of love." It was "expedient" too, because if Christ had remained upon the earth, he could not have been at more than one place at one and the same time, whereas all his followers would want to be with him all the time. But that "other Comforter" being an infinite Spirit, without a corporeal appendage, can be everywhere at one and the same time. The bearing this has upon the preposterous dogma of the corporeal presence of Christ in the "tremendous sacrifice of the altar," and upon the fanatical dream of the premillennial Adventists, is obvious, but foreign from the present discussion.

The word Παράκλητος is used but five times in the New Testament—four times in the passages cited [in § 8], where it is rendered "Comforter," and once in 1 John ii. 1, where it is applied to Christ, and rendered "Advocate." It does not mean simply Comforter, unless the old meaning of *comforter* be understood, as in the phrase "giving aid and comfort." In the days of Wycliffe it had that import. Luther uses the word *Tröster*, in the sense of intercessor, surety, representative. He thus comments on it: "One who stands as the counsel of an accused party, who takes of his to defend him, who pleads his cause, and serves him by advice and help, admonition and encouragement, as his case needs." Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ernesti, Michaelis, Campbell, and others render it "Monitor," "Teacher," and the like; but this is too restricted. Tholuck and others "Helper:" this is too indefinite. Pearson, Knapp, Stier, and others, "Advocate," which is a literal rendering of *Parakletos*; but, as its meaning has been narrowed in modern usage, perhaps the analogous word *Patron* will better express the sense of this pregnant word, as it comprehends the meaning of both Advocate and Counselor, which were formerly blended in one. Thus as Christ is our Advocate—*Patron*—with the Father, so the Spirit is the Advocate—*Patron*—with us; the former objectively, the latter subjectively—Christ *for* us, the Spirit *in* us. (Rom. viii. 26, 27.) We

are his *clients*, and he is called on for help, as the title intimates, whenever he is needed, and that is all the time. He is always accessible, because he is an infinite and eternal *Spirit*. He surrounds us like the atmosphere, and his gracious influence will inspire and animate us, if we do not contumaciously close the avenues by which he enters into the soul. (Rev. iii. 20.) All who obey Christ have his representation—*for them* as a

Patron, *in* Them as a *Spirit*. He will be as truly and intimately with the Church through all the Christian age—forever—though not as ostensibly and marvelously, as when he descended on the Day of Pentecost, on the first disciples, and enabled them to speak with other tongues and perform the most astounding miracles. He is competent, or adequate, to the undertaking for which he is called on by his clients.

§ 10. The Spirit of the Truth.

He is an infallible Counselor: the Spirit of the truth—*i. e.*, of the great system of Christianity. Thus he may be consulted in the Scriptures, as they are read and searched by us (1 Cor. ii. 9–13; 2 Pet. i. 19–21); and as they are preached by those who through his agency are made overseers of the flock of God (Acts xx. 28; 1 Thess. v. 19–22). He teaches us by direct and immediate action on the soul. If one human spirit can act on another human spirit, surely the Holy Spirit, who is not confined by barriers of flesh and blood, can operate directly upon our spirits. (John iii. 5, 6.) The mode of his operation, like that of the atmosphere, is of course inscrutable. He can communicate original ideas to the mind. This is his miraculous operation. He thus inspired the ancient prophets and apostles. (2 Pet. i. 21; Luke xii. 11, 12.) In a similar way he can recall to the mind things previously known, but forgotten, and that with perfect accuracy. He did this in the case of the apostles, reviving in their minds all that their Lord had told them while they were under his tutelage; and thus by his plenary inspiration, they became infallible, as the authorized teachers of the Church. (John xiv. 26.) It is absurd and blasphemous for popes and councils to arrogate such prerogatives.

But there is a moral influence which all may experience. The Spirit does thus operate on every human spirit. He does this by antagonizing the oppositions of sin and Satan so that the voice of conscience may be heard. As he is sent forth by the Father to do this, his gracious influences are called "the drawings of the Father." (John vi.) As they go before all efforts of men to secure their salvation and do the will of God, they are sometimes characterized as "preventing grace." He works with us that we may have the will and power to seek and serve the Lord, though

he does not force anyone to action. (Acts vii. 51; Phil. ii. 12, 13.) When the subjects of his influence concur with his gracious operations, they are regenerated by his soul-renewing power. (John iii. 5, 6; Rom. viii. 1–17.) He so operates upon our moral consciousness that when this change is effected he causes us to realize our filial relation to God. He does so by shedding abroad the love of God in our hearts (Rom. v. 5); by bearing witness with our spirits that we are the children of God (Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6); and by sealing us for heaven (2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, 14; iv. 30). As the seal is applied for recognition (Ezek. ix. 4, 6; Rev. vii. 3); for confirmation (John vi. 27); and for conservation (Deut. xxxii. 34), so the Spirit dwells in all the saints, and in this way and for these ends seals the heirs of heaven. He causes them also to realize such moral changes as imply a state of grace. (2 Cor. i 12.) By his own light, he reveals his own working, as he carries the soul forward to perfect holiness. Then as our Advocate he is all powerful. He never lost a case that was properly intrusted to him.

He pleads with us on God's behalf. "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith. To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." (Heb. iii. 7, 8.) He enables us to plead with God. (Rom. viii. 26, 27.) As Christ pleads *for* us, so the Holy Spirit pleads *in* us and *by* us. He suggests and dictates, and we indorse and adopt his gracious inspiration. As Bunyan puts it in his "Holy War," where he represents the penitent inhabitants of the town of Man-Soul as availing themselves of the Spirit's aid in drawing up their petition to their offended Prince, Immanuel, the Spirit says: "Yourselves must be present at the doing of it. True the hand and pen shall be

mine, but the ink and paper must be yours—else how can you say it is your petition? Nor have I need to petition for myself, because I have not offended."

In his capacity as our Advocate he secures for us all our rights. We have a chartered right to conquer all our spiritual enemies—he enables us so to do. (Eph. vi.) We have a chartered right, "being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, to serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and in righteousness before him all the days of our life." (Luke i. 74, 75) This corresponds with his expressive title, for he is called "Holy," not only because he is absolutely free from all moral pravity himself, but because he is also the Source of all holiness. (Gal. v. 22, 23.)

Chapter II. Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

§ 1. Personality of the Holy Ghost.

397

The foregoing testimonies concerning the procession of the Spirit—in both senses, ontological and economical—conclusively prove that the Spirit is a Person, and not, as the Socinians say, a mere influence and emanation of the Father. There are numerous passages of Scripture where the term Spirit, or Holy Spirit, does mean influence or operation; but then it is obviously by metonymy, the agent being used for the result of his agency. (Eph. i. 17, *et al.*) But there are many passages which unequivocally show that the Spirit is a person as truly as the Father or the Son. Hence he proceedeth, and is sent forth, as a person, not as an attribute or mere emanation. Not merely is the masculine article used, as agreeing with the masculine Παράκλητος, *Parakletos*—as the neuter article is used agreeing with the neuter πνεῦμα—but the masculine pronoun ἐκεῖνος, "he," is employed, and he is spoken of as ἄλλος, "another Comforter," sent forth from and by the Father and the Son to take the place of the Son. In like manner he is associated with the Father and the Son in the formulas of baptism and benediction (Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 14), and in other places; surely it is not meant to join together the Father, the Son, and an attribute of the Father! He is spoken of as administering spiritual gifts (1 Cor. xii.); "searching all things" (1 Cor. ii. 10); interceding, regenerating, sealing, witnessing, sanctifiying, inspiring, appointing and sending ministers, abiding in the Church, and performing other acts and exercises, including the raising of the dead bodies of Christ and the saints, and sustaining other relations, which postulate a distinct personality, as well as absolute divinity.

§ 2. Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The article proceeds to state that the Holy Ghost "is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son,

398
very and eternal God." "Of one substance" in the Latin is, *ejusdem essentiae*, of the same essence. There are not three substances, or essences, in the God-head—that is Tritheism; but only one spiritual nature, possessed alike by the three Infinite Persons.

As there is a perfect equality in regard to the Divine Essence, so is there in regard to the Divine Majesty. The power and authority of the Father and the Son is equally possessed by the Holy Ghost.

So the glory of the Father and the Son is the glory of the Divine Spirit. All the infinite perfections which shine forth in the Father and the Son shine forth also in the Holy Ghost. He bears the names, possesses the attributes, performs the work, and receives the honors of essential Deity, and is therefore truly styled "very and eternal God." *Verus*, "very," means true, real—not by figure of speech; "eternal" imports that his essential nature is unoriginated, underived, not delegated and supervenient. He is called *God* (Acts v. 3, 4) and *Lord* (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18)—as in the Creed of Constantinople, "the Lord, the Life-giver," where "the Lord" is to be taken in an absolute sense—not as frequently "the Lord of life, and the Giver of life." He is the Lord, the Supreme Sovereign—the absolute Proprietor and Governor of the universe, as he is the Giver of life to all that live. He is eternal (Heb. ix. 15), omnipotent (Rom. xv. 19; 1 Cor. xii. 11), omnipresent (Ps. cxxxix. 7), omniscient (1 Cor. ii. 10), wise (Eph. i. 17), good (Ps. cxliii. 10), and all the qualities predicated of him are infinite, like his essence.

He displays those perfections in the performance of works which none but God can accomplish—such as creation and preservation (Gen. i. 2; Job xxxiii. 4; Ps. civ. 30); and resurrection (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 18). So the regeneration and sanctification of men, which is his proper work, implies divine power; for none but God can bring a clean thing out of an unclean. The inspiration of prophets and apostles and the efficacious inherent power of working miracles, by any human agency or no agency at all, demonstrate his essential and supreme Deity.

He is accordingly worshiped as divine. We are baptized in his name, as well as in the name of the Father and the Son (Matt. xxviii. 19); and he is invoked with the other persons in the solemn formula of apostolic benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

399
And as One of the Sacred Three he is adored by the Seraphim, who

cry one to another: “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.” (Isa. vi. 3; *cf.* ver. 8–10; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 25, 26.) And a sin against him is a sin against God, and one of peculiar turpitude, in view of his special economical work. (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Acts v. 3, 4; vii. 51; Eph. iv. 30.) But if there were no specific texts of this class to prove his essential Divinity, it would follow from his Personality, as proceeding from the Father and the Son; for if he were an emanation or influence put forth by the Father and the Son, it would be a divine emanation or influence; but as he is a Person, like the Father and the Son, and proceeding from both, he must be alike Divine.

Thus while the article opposes Socinianism, which denies the Personality of the Spirit—asserting that he is only a divine energy, emanation, or influence—it is also leveled against Arianism, which asserts that as the Son of God is a creature, having been called into being, before all worlds, so the Holy Spirit is a creation—κτίσμα κτίσματος, the creature of a creature, being brought into existence by the agency of the Son. So of all the modifications of these heresies by the Macedonians and other so-called Pneumatomachians, or Fighters against the Spirit.

It was therefore eminently wise to insert in the Confession a distinct Article, “Of the Holy Ghost,” and to so frame it as to propound his Essential Deity and his Divine Personality,

§ 3. Importance of This Article.

Though this is the shortest of the Twenty-five Articles, and next to the shortest of the Thirty-nine Articles, yet it is of equal importance with any in the Confession.

The mercy of the Father or the merit of the Son would be of no avail to us without the grace of the Holy Ghost. Every thing in the kingdom of God is dispensed by his influence, hence that kingdom, as now administered, is called emphatically the dispensation of the Spirit. No one can become a subject of it but by being born again through his gracious influence; none can know that they are recognized as loyal subjects of the realm but by his testimony; none can be made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, in the kingdom of glory, but by the sanctification of the Spirit and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus

Christ—a baptism which he alone administers. Repentance, faith, prayer, praise—all the acts and exercises of religion—are performed by his assistance; all are "the fruit of the Spirit."

The ministry of the word is "the ministration of the Spirit," as he calls and qualifies and appoints men to this work, making them overseers of the Church of God. All their official acts are made efficacious to the ends designed by his inspiration. Preaching is sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal unless it is in the demonstration of the Spirit. He prepares the soil for the reception of the good seed of the kingdom, and waters the seed when it is sown, and causes it to spring up and bring forth fruit, first the blade, then the ear, and after that the fall corn in the ear. The sacraments are administered under his sanction so as to constitute the Church in one body and nourish it accordingly. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) And the cup of blessing which we bless, and the bread which we break, are the communion of the body and blood of Christ, because his Spirit takes the things of Christ and shows them to us, so that this great mystery is at once

Figure and means of saving grace.

Thus if Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit is the Heart of the Church, his mystic body, sending the vital influence through all its members. With great propriety therefore do we say in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints"—the latter being the body in which the former dwells. And in the Constantinopolitan Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets; and I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church." The two must go together. For though the Spirit does operate in many ways outside of the Church, yet we are to seek him there, as that is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and without his informing presence the body of the Church is a helpless and ghastly corpse. He, and he alone, fills it with life and health and power, according to the symbol of the pristine creation, when "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. ii. 7.)

Chapter III. The Dispensation of the Spirit.

§ 1. Scriptural Notion of the Spirit's Dispensation.

401

When theologians speak of "the dispensation of the Spirit," it is scarcely necessary to say that they do not mean to exclude the Father and the Son from all participation in the work of man's salvation since the exaltation of Christ; nor that the Spirit was so excluded before that period. All the sacred Persons of the Trinity have always been, and always will be, concerned in this great work. The meaning is, that in some peculiar manner the Holy Spirit is now employed in the great economy of redemption as he never was before, and as neither the Father nor the Son is employed.

"God is a Spirit," or, rather, God is *Spirit*, that is, a spiritual essence, exclusively so, having no material nature like that which envelops our spiritual entity. The second Person of the Trinity, indeed, for economic purposes, assumed a material vehicle, and is still "clothed with a body like our own;" but his divine nature, like that of the first and third Persons, is exclusively spiritual—"without body or parts."

Still there is a valid reason for distinguishing the third Person as "the Spirit of God"—"proceeding from the Father and the Son"—and so "the Spirit of the Father," and also "the Spirit of the Son." This distinction in the Godhead is natural, necessary, immanent, eternal. What manifestations of the personality of the Holy Spirit there may have been before our world was created, God has not seen proper to reveal. But so soon as that great development of divine power takes place, then there is a display of his omnific energy. He operates not as the *Anima Mundi*, the Soul of the World, clothing himself with a pantheistic covering of materiality—a conception of an effete paganism, which some of the scientists of our day are endeavoring to resuscitate. He is no part of the world which he created, and that world is no part of him. His essence is infinite, indivisible,

402

and uncompoundable; be gives life to all, and keeps all in being,

renewing the face of the earth as he first created it.

There is no wisdom, nor device, nor knowledge, that is not from him. He inspired Bezaleel and Aholiab, and those who wrought with them, in the "cunning work" of the tabernacle. He "clothed" judges and kings, prophets and priests, with the qualifications for their respective functions. As he empowered man in his state of innocence for the production of all moral virtue, so ever since the Fall he has been operating upon the hearts of men to restore them to the forfeited favor and image of God. We are safe in saying that there has never been any moral good in the universe that was not of his origination. All holy intelligences co-operate with his gracious influences in the performance of all their virtuous actions.

He operates with or without the written word—only more demonstrably and thoroughly and efficaciously with it than without it. When he operates with it, it is not merely by the virtue of the divine principles and sentiments which it embodies; but as a living, all-powerful, personal Agent. "The sword of the Spirit is the word of God," and whosoever may wield it, the Spirit himself is the great efficacious Agent. Thus is it now, and thus has it ever been.

But when we speak of "the dispensation of the Spirit," we mean what John meant when he said, "This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." We mean what Jesus meant when he said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall send you another Comforter (*Paraclete*), that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of [the] truth." "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." This divine *Paraclete* is a Person, distinct from the Father and the Son; hence he is spoken of as sent by the Father and the Son—as *another Paraclete*—Jesus being one himself (1 John ii. 2.)—and designated by masculine pronouns, showing that he is not a mere emanation or influence, but a Person, distinct from the Father and the Sou, though not of a different essence.

§ 2. The New Dispensation.

It was his peculiar office to authenticate the mission and work

of Jesus as the Messiah, which he did by the prodigies of the Day of Pentecost, and to empower the apostles for their great work. Thus was fulfilled the prophecy of Joel, and of John the Baptist, and of Jesus himself: “Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” “Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” He not only thus confirmed the divine legation of Jesus, and qualified the apostles for their peculiar office, and inaugurated thus miraculously the New Dispensation; but he raised the believers in Christ to a higher plane of the religious life than was ever before attained, and to more exalted privileges and prerogatives than were ever before enjoyed. The atonement being made, and Christ having entered into his glory, greater light is poured into the understaudings of those who believe in Jesus, and larger measures of sanctity and moral power and peace and joy are experienced by them than by “the elders,” who had realized, indeed, “the common salvation”—the same in kind, but not in degree. The Patriarchal Dispensation was transcended by the Jewish, but the Apostle says that “even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth.” (2 Cor. iii.)

§ 3. Edification of the Church.

But not only in respect to the personal experience of believers is this emphatically the dispensation of the Spirit, but also with regard to the functions which are officially exercised for the edification and development of the Church. To whatever extent the Spirit may have been vouchsafed to prophets and priests under the old dispensations, it is very obvious that he is more intimately and powerfully and demonstrably present with all who are called on to exercise any official functions in the Church of Christ. This refers pre-eminently to those who, by way of distinction, and in a peculiar sense, are “ministers,” “separated to the gospel of God,” “overseers” placed over the flock of Christ by “the Holy Ghost.” But we need not restrict it to any such limited range. The distinction between “clergy” and “laity” is not so sharply defined in the New Testament as in our systematic theologies. Sometimes, indeed, the distinction seems to disappear, and “all the Lord’s people are prophets”—or, if

not prophets, all seem to have some function assigned them,

something to do for the edification of the body of Christ, and the conversion of the world; and every one is called upon to seek the grace necessary for the sphere in which he is called to move, and to perform the work which has been assigned him to do. This seems to be the teaching of the Apostle in Rom. xii. 4–8: "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness." This is more specifically drawn out in that famous passage, 1 Cor. xii. 1–13, which is classical on this subject, and as such we quote it at length: "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led. Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Now nothing is clearer than this, that as all are called by the

Spirit to exercise their peculiar functions, so all should seek from him the requisite qualifications for their profitable employment. We cannot, *e. g.*, teach in Sunday-school to effect without the Spirit's aid. If we pray effectually we must "pray in the Spirit;" he must "help our infirmities." If we preach or govern, or do aught else, in the name of Christ and for the promotion of his cause, all must be done "by the Spirit of God." We admit that many of the functions alluded to by the Apostle were of a miraculous and extraordinary character, and none but fanatics will expect to be clothed with such in our day; yet the ordinary and non-miraculous endowments mentioned by the Apostle are as truly *charismata*—gifts of the Spirit—as were those of "healing" or "tongues" or "prophecy." Every thing must be done "in the Spirit"—that is, according to his will, at his prompting, and by his strength.

What are sermons? what are sacraments? what are sacrifices? what are disciplines, and constitutions, and councils? what is the ministry? what is the Church itself, if not guided, and informed, and controlled by the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who is to abide forever in the Church for this object and end?

While none can pray acceptably and fruitfully without the Spirit, we are encouraged to ask that he might be bestowed upon us in all his gifts and graces, to subserve all the ends of the Christian life, personal and official. Here is the assurance of Christ himself: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" He himself prayed the Father to send the Spirit down upon his disciples, and he still intercedes for us in this behalf. Let us join our prayers with his:

> Father, glorify thy son:
> Answ'ring his all-powerful prayer.
> Send that Intercessor down,
> Send that other Comforter,
> Whom believingly we claim,
> Whom we ask in Jesus' name.

Nothing pleases our heavenly Patron more than to be frequently called upon for assistance. We can give no better proof that we have used grace previously given than by asking for more grace. Indeed, in no other way can we utilize the gifts of the Spirit.

Chapter IV. The Witness of the Spirit.

§ 1. Definition and Method.

406

The witness of the Spirit is a comfortable persuasion of our acceptance with God produced by the Holy Spirit. There is a scholastic, metaphysical method of handling this subject which is not well adapted to our purpose; and there is a popular method which we earnestly recommend and adopt. In the latter method we have more to do with particular texts of Scripture, lively metaphors, pertinent illustrations, personal experiences, and the like. In the former method we have more to do with abstract argument, with as little metaphor as possible. We cannot, indeed, do without metaphor. The very title by which the Third Person of the Trinity is known—"the Spirit"—is metaphorical, and it is highly expressive as such.

§ 2. Universality of the Spirit's Operation.

No symbol can so well set forth his nature and operations as the atmospheric air. This element surrounds us and enters into every place in the physical world from which it is not debarred; and so does the Holy Spirit in the moral world. His gracious influence is exerted upon all moral beings that do not willfully resist it. The Spirit operates upon unconscious infancy, upon childhood as it develops into intellectual and moral life, and upon matured humanity in all its stages; influencing all, but forcing none; and proportioning his influence to the concurrence of the subject. In the case of those who have divine revelation, the Spirit operates through and by the word, and, indeed, through and by the Church, sacraments, and every thing that suggests religious truth to the mind; but he is not tied to any outward means, though he suspends many of his gracious operations upon our due employment of them.

He operates upon the entire man—intellect, sensibilities, and will. If there is an instant concurrence with his operations, our

intellect receives the truth, our sensibilities are affected by it

according to our personal relation to it, and our will makes choice of it, yields to it, puts it into practice. This takes place within the realm of consciousness. The Holy Spirit is the prime mover. Without his influence there could be no available thought, feeling, or volition, in regard to God and duty.

§ 3. The Witness.

When he operates upon our minds, and we concur with his operations, there is a consciousness of the fact realized by us—a mental impression of it is produced. This, in regard to its divine origination, is the witness of the Holy Spirit; in regard to the subjective apperception of it, the realization of it by the reflecting mind of the subject, it is the witness of our own spirit. The word witness, or testimony, is a forensic term. As the deposition of a witness makes us acquainted with facts or events of which we should be otherwise ignorant, so the influence of the Holy Spirit upon our minds gives us a sense of the divine favor, and excites correspondent feelings toward God; hence it is figuratively styled the witness of the Spirit. The clearness of this testimony depends upon various circumstances, such as age, mental and moral development, the bias of education, peculiarity of temperament, and the like. Some persons are of a mercurial, some of a jovial, some of a saturnine, temperament—borrowing the terms of the old astrologers—hence some will be quick to discover the tokens of divine favor; some will go on their way rejoicing, never doubting their acceptance in the Beloved; while others are slow of heart to believe, dull in their spiritual senses, and inclined to look at the dark side of every thing connected with their religious experience. Their faith is genuine, but it is mingled with doubt, and according to their faith so is the witness of their acceptance. The subject admits of a vast diversity, a gradation from the faint streak of the morning light spread upon the mountains to the full blaze of sunshine, the meridian evidence which puts all doubt to flight. Hence the profound remarks of Richard Watson agree with the psychology of the subject, as well as actual experience. He says:[1]

This doctrine has been generally termed the doctrine of assurance; and perhaps the expressions of St. Paul, “the full assurance of faith,” and “the full assurance

of hope,” may warrant the use of the word. But as there is a current and generally understood sense of this term among persons of the Calvinistic persuasion, implying that the assurance of our present acceptance and sonship is an assurance of our final perseverance, and of our indefeasible title to heaven, the phrase, a comfortable persuasion or conviction of our justification and adoption, arising out of the Spirit’s inward and direct testimony, is to be preferred; for this has been held as an indubitable doctrine of holy writ by Christians who by no means receive the doctrine of assurance in the sense held by the followers of Calvin.

There is also another reason for the sparing and cautious use of the term assurance, which is that it seems to imply, though not necessarily, the absence of all doubt, and shuts out all those lower degrees of persuasion which may exist in the experience of Christians. For, as our faith may not at first, or at all times, be equally strong, the testimony of the Spirit may have its degrees of strength, and our persuasion or conviction be proportionately regulated. Yet if faith be genuine, God respects its weaker exercises, and encourages its growth, by affording measures of comfort, and degrees of this testimony. Nevertheless, while this is allowed, the fullness of this attainment is to be pressed upon every one that believes, according to the word of God: “Let us draw near,” says St. Paul to all Christians, “with full assurance of faith.”

It may serve also to remove an objection sometimes made to the doctrine, and to correct an error which sometimes pervades the statement of it, to observe that this assurance, persuasion, or conviction, whichever term be adopted, is not of the essence of justifying faith; that is, that justifying faith does not consist in the assurance that I am now forgiven, through Christ. This would be obviously contradictory. For we must believe before we can be justified; much more before we can be assured, in any degree, that we are justified; and this persuasion, therefore, follows justification, and is one of its results. We believe in order to justification; but we cannot be persuaded of our forgiveness in order to it, for the persuasion would be false. But though we must not only distinguish but separate this persuasion of our acceptance from the faith which justifies, we must not separate but only distinguish it from justification itself. With that come, as concomitants, regeneration, adoption, and, as far as we have any information from Scripture, the “Spirit of adoption,” though, as in all other cases, in various degrees of operation.

But, as we have already intimated, it is not expedient in our ordinary ministry to discuss this subject in a severely logical and metaphysical manner. Children, ignorant persons, people in general,

cannot follow us in such discussions, and cannot be profited by them. It is well enough to let them know that this great doctrine has a firm psychological basis on which it rests; but it must be presented to them in the popular style. We may adopt the *organon* or method by which we argue other questions, as, *e. g.*, the resurrection of Christ, by presumptions, proofs, and demonstrations.

§ 4. Presumptions.

In favor of our acquiring a knowledge of our filial relation to
409
God, there are presumptions, as, for instance: We have an innate desire of certainty in regard to important things—and our relation to God and eternity is the most important of all. It is not absurd to suppose that God would furnish us the means of acquiring some knowledge in the premises.

There are intimations among the heathen. The most enlightened among them said, "We are all the offspring of God." The beautiful fable of Phaeton, who sought some token of his divine descent; the auguries which they practiced, and the oracles which they consulted, are fragments of primitive tradition in reference to this matter.

The Jewish Scriptures, of course, contain the doctrine; but even in the decadence of the Jewish religion their tradition concerning the scape-goat, that the scarlet thread around his neck turned white in token of the pardon of their sin (*Cf.* Isa. i. 18), and the *Bath Kol* which they said spoke forth from the holy oracle, and assured them of the acceptance of their persons and offerings, were grotesque travesties of this doctrine.

The papists ridicule it, yet they have vestiges of it in their priestly pardons, indulgences, and the like. When Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, baptized Clovis, the King of the Franks, it is said that a milk-white dove with a cruse of oil around its neck was let down before the monarch, who was assured by this *miracle* that he was restored by baptism to primitive innocence, and was anointed with the unction of the Holy One.

The "old divines" held this doctrine, though with some erroneous appendages, which constituted a serious embargo upon it —as the assurance of final perseverance and eternal salvation,

which Bossuet urged as a capital objection to the doctrine, whereas it has nothing to do with the doctrine itself. But almost all Christians have some notion of it. The Fathers, especially Chrysostom and Augustin, were very pronounced in their belief of the witness of the Spirit; even mediaeval writers held it, with some distortion. We have found it in the writings of Roman Catholics and of those Protestants who, like the Romanists, ridicule it as fanaticism. Indeed, they cannot hold to Christian experience at all without involving both the work and the witness of the Spirit.

These are strong presumptions in favor of the doctrine.

§ 5. Proofs.

410

Then there are numerous infallible proofs of it in the Holy Scriptures. It is inculcated in every way in which a doctrine can be inculcated, as, *e. g.*, by dogmatic statement: "We know that we are of God." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." (1 John v. 19; iii. 2.)

By argument: Thus it is argued to in Rom. v. 1–5: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed: because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Gal. iv. 6: "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." It is argued from in Rom. viii. 15–17: "Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (*Cf.* Eph. i. 13, 14.)

It is inculcated by precept. Job xxii. 21: "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee." Heb. x. 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." (*Cf.* Heb. vi. 11.)

By promise: Isa. liv. 13: "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children." (*Cf.* John vi.

45.) Jer. xxxi. 34: “They shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” (*Cf.* Heb. viii. 8–12.) Luke i. 77: “To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins.” John vii. 17: “If any man will do his will”—is disposed, resolved to do his will—“he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.” John xiv. 15–23: “If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he

dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”

It is inculcated by threatening. 2 Thess. i. 7, 8: “The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God.” 2 Pet. i. 9: “But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.” Those who willfully remain ignorant of God, as a sin-forgiving God, cannot develop the fruit of the Spirit, which pertains to a holy life, and are therefore justly punishable for their ignorance. Thus in Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, “Ignorance” is denied admittance into the Celestial City because he could not produce his “certificate.”

It is inculcated by prayer, which is a most affecting and conclusive method of settling a question. Wise and good men—especially inspired men—would not pray for unattainable objects. Now mark how Paul prays for the Ephesian Church (Eph. i. 15–18; iii. 14–19): “Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you,

making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted

and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and depth and length and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God." And for the Colossians: Col. i. 9–14: "For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding; that ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness; giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." No one will say that if those for whom the Apostle thus prayed put no bar to the answer, they did not receive that for which the Apostle prayed; and surely no one can experience such divine communications, and be destitute of the witnessing Spirit. (*Cf.* Num. vi. 24–27; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Phil. iv. 6, 7.)

Then the doctrine is inculcated by examples: *e. g.*, Abel, Enoch, Abraham, David, Job, Paul, John—all the holy men of ancient times who held communion with God.

§ 6. Demonstrations.

But there are also demonstrations of this doctrine. Any one may

see by the pregnant presumptions and the cogent proofs adduced that the doctrine must be true, and yet he may have no demonstrative evidence of it in his own experience. But then every one may realize its truth by personal experience. In the nature of the case there is no reason why every man whose mind is in a normal state may not have the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins. It is not the result of labored processes of ratiocination; it is not dependent upon subtile analysis of the Spirit's occult operations upon the soul; it is not the peculiar reward of a high state of sanctity, or of a long-continuance in well-doing; but it is the consequence of faith in the atoning blood. "Because ye are sons [though but newly begotten] God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, 'Abba, Father.'" This is what thousands have realized, in their experience.

413

It is only necessary for us to add that as this privilege is for all, none should be satisfied without it. In this case, "To enjoy is to obey." Seek it earnestly and importunately by prayer and faith. But do not prescribe any particular method by which God shall reveal his pardoning love to your soul. Take not the peculiar experience of any for your standard. We have known many persons greatly distressed because the circumstances of their case were not like those of others. You have nothing to do with that. The experience of Mr. Fearing, and Mr. Ready-to-halt, and Mr. Little-faith was as genuine, though not for awhile as comfortable, as the experience of Hopeful and Faithful. You have nothing to do with times and places and other circumstances. If you can say, "One thing I know: that whereas I was blind, now I see," that is all-sufficient. We have sometimes been tempted to wish that some men could not point to the time and place when they first received the pledge of love, as they seemed disposed to live on past experience. "Do you now believe?" Does the Spirit now bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God? Recollect, the witness does not consist in any outward manifestations, or peculiar ecstasies, or sudden translations from darkness to light, which may or may not accompany its first reception, or its renewed realization. If there is a settled conviction that God is mine and I am his; that I do believe in the Son of God, and have the witness in myself, though there may be no peculiar emotion excited, it matters not. But bear in mind that you cannot be happy, and so you cannot be holy, without it, in a less or greater

degree. The fruit of the Spirit results from both his work and his witness. “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” We have first in the order of grace, the work and witness of the Holy Spirit, and then the work and witness of our own spirit, which really coalesce, as all is under the conduct of the Holy Spirit. “For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world.” Having realized this blessing by faith, confirm it by obedience. For the witness of adoption is confirmed by the seal of sanctification. You will not doubt that you are pardoned abundantly when you are sanctified wholly.

414

[Upon this vital doctrine of Scripture which Methodism has done so much to define and illustrate, let us listen to Mr. Wesley:

The testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the souls of believers, whereby the Spirit of God directly testifies to their spirit that they are children of God. . . . We believe there is [such a direct testimony]; because this is the plain natural meaning of the text [Rom. viii. 16], illustrated both by the preceding words [Rom. viii. 14, 15] and by the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Galatians [Gal. iv. 5–7]; because, in the nature of the thing, the testimony must precede the fruit which springs from it; and, because this plain meaning of the word of God is confirmed by the experience of innumerable children of God; yea, and by the experience of all who are convinced of sin, who can never rest till they have a direct witness; and even of the children of the world, who, not having the witness in themselves, one and all declare, none can know his sins forgiven.

But does Methodism teach that the Spirit’s witness is of the essence of justifying faith? Mr. Wesley denies:

Is justifying faith a sense of pardon? *Negatur.* 1. Every one is deeply concerned to understand this question well; but preachers most of all. 2. By *justifying faith* I mean that faith which whosoever hath not is under the wrath and the curse of God. By *a sense of pardon* I mean a distinct, explicit assurance that my sins are forgiven. If justifying faith necessarily implies such an explicit assurance of pardon, then every one who has it not and every one so long as he has it not is under the wrath and the curse of God. But this is a supposition contrary to Scripture as well as to experience; contrary to Isa. l. 10, and Acts x. 34, 35. Again the assertion “justifying faith is a sense of pardon” is contrary to reason: it is flatly absurd. For how can a sense of pardon be the *condition* of our receiving it?

But Methodism has always exhorted Christians to seek the direct witness, and in this again is true to Mr. Wesley's teaching:

Let none rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness. There may be foretastes of joy, of peace, of love, and those not delusive, but really from God, long before we have the witness in ourselves; before the Spirit of God witnesses with our spirits that we have "redemption in the blood of Jesus, even the forgiveness of sins." Yea, there may be a degree of long-suffering, of gentleness, of fidelity, meekness, temperance (not a shadow thereof, but a real degree, by the preventing grace of God), before we "are accepted in the Beloved," and, consequently, before we have a testimony of our acceptance: but it is by no means advisable to rest here; it is at the peril of our souls if we do. If we are wise we shall be continually crying to God, until his Spirit cry in our heart, "Abba, Father!" This is the privilege of all the children of God, and without this we can never be assured that we are his children. . . . But when we have once received the Spirit of adoption, this "peace which passeth all understanding," and which expels all painful doubt and fear, will "keep our hearts and minds in Christ Jesus." And when this has brought forth its genuine fruit, all inward and outward holiness, it is undoubtedly the will of him that calleth us to give us always what he has once given; so that there is no need that we should ever more be deprived of either the testimony of God's Spirit or the testimony of our own, the consciousness of our walking in all righteousness and true holiness.]

---

1. "Institutes," Vol. II., Chap. xxiv., p. 511.↩

Book V. Bibliology;
or,
The Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures.

I. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation. (Article V.)
II. Of the Old Testament. (Article VI.)

Part I.

Article V.
Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

417

The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may he proved thereby, is not to he required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

The Names of the Canonical Books.

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The First Book of Samuel, The Second Book of Samuel, The First Book of Kings, The Second Book of Kings, The First Book of Chronicles, The Second Book of Chronicles, The Book of Ezra, The Book of Nehemiah, The Book of Esther, The Book of Job, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less. All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

Introduction.

This article corresponds to the Sixth Article of the Anglican Confession—except that in the title Mr. Wesley put the article "the" before "Holy Scriptures;" and some printer, if not editor, omitted the preposition "of," which begins the title of every article. At the General Conference, May, 1878, the word "Of," which had been dropped from the title, at our instance was restored. In 1816, "The Holy Scriptures contain," was substituted for "Holy Scripture containeth," perhaps to conform it to the title, though the singular form is retained in the second

sentence. Mr. Wesley substituted “The Book of Ezra,” and “The Book of Nehemiah,” for “The First Book of Esdras,” and “The Second Book of Esdras,” and very properly, as the names of these books are so changed in our Authorized Version of the Bible. It was an oversight that he did not change the old form “Hester” to “Esther,” as has since been done.

Mr. Wesley omitted the reference to the Apocrypha, and the list of books contained in it, as he excluded it from the “Proper Lessons;” though he allowed one of the two sentences from Tobit to remain in the sentences at the offertory, which have since been omitted. In the last sentence of the article, Mr. Wesley omitted the word “them” before “canonical.”

In the Confession of 1552 this article treated only of the Sufficiency of Scripture for Salvation, omitting the list of books and all reference to the Apocrypha. But it added after the words, “proved thereby,” these words: “Although it be sometime received of the godly, and profitable for our order and comeliness, yet no man ought to be constrained to believe it as an article of faith,” etc.

In some confessions the article on the Rule of Faith is placed before all others, as all others are tested by it. But the English Reformers wished to give prominence to those articles which are recognized as the grand essentials of catholic Christianity, to show that the Anglican Church of the Reformation was eminently orthodox and catholic. This being done, it then seems proper to set forth the great standard by which the truth of those articles is established.

Chapter I. The Pertinency and Genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

§ 1. Preliminary.

419

When it is said that this article sets forth the Rule of Faith, the synecdoche is apparent. It embraces not only the *Credenda*, but also the *Agenda* and the *Petenda* of religion: all that we are to believe, all that we are to practice, and all that we are to pray for; as Faith, Love, and Hope, the three theological virtues, comprise the whole of religion. They comprehend all things necessary to salvation; and they are all contained in Holy Scripture. That is to say, as the article explains it, every thing necessary to salvation is either "read therein," in so many words, or "may be proved thereby," by clear, logical, satisfactory inference or argument. The sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for salvation is set forth in the article positively and dogmatically, and also negatively and polemically.

It is set forth positively and dogmatically: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation;" negatively and polemically: "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." That the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation may be seen when, upon close investigation, they will appear to be (1) pertinent, (2) genuine, (3) authentic, and (4) exhaustive. [Their pertinency and genuineness will engage our attention throughout the remainder of this chapter.]

§ 2. Pertinency of the Holy Scriptures.

The sacred writings are *pertinent*: their authors undertake to treat on the subject of salvation; and what they write is relevant to their theme. In a certain sense, indeed, the Bible is cyclopedic in its character. It consists of sixty-six books. These books contain histories and prophecies, narratives and biographies,

420
sermons and songs, epistles and dissertations, proverbs and parables. All kinds of lore, divine and human, are intermingled, in all kinds of styles, so as to attract attention, sustain interest, and reward investigation. In these respects the volume of revelation corresponds with the volume of nature, and thus shows that it came from the same divine original.

Some books seem to have no bearing on the subject of salvation, *e. g.*, The Book of Esther and The Song of Solomon (ignoring the evangelical spiritualizing of the latter), as they do not, except in composition, even contain the name of God. Then we have the cosmogony of Moses, chronologies, genealogies, itineraries, accounts of the rise, decline, and fall of empires, and other matters of a secular character, which seem to have no bearing on the subject of salvation.

But upon closer examination it will be found that the history of salvation could not be given without giving, at least in epitome, a history of the race for whom salvation is provided. There must be an account of its origin and primeval character, its fall and the preliminaries of its redemption. The character of man is best seen in the concrete: hence the histories and biographies of the Bible. In them human nature is developed in all its characteristics. Human nature, with all its varieties, is essentially the same in every age and clime. A missionary in India was attacked by a Brahman, who denied that the Bible dates from a high antiquity; "for," said he, "I can prove that one chapter has been written since you arrived in India—I mean Romans i. I am sure you could never have written so exact a description of the Hindoos if you had not first seen them." The Rev. William Arthur says he presented an intelligent Hindoo with a translation of Romans i. After reading he exclaimed with amazement, "Who told Paul about us? He has never been here!"

The Old Testament Scriptures were necessary to prepare the race for redemption by Christ; and as "the Redeemer was to come out of Zion"—"salvation being of the Jews"—it was necessary to give a somewhat detailed history of the chosen race. An account of other nations is given, less or more detailed, as they came in contact with Israel, and as all are alike interested in the covenant of redemption, though they were

421
aliens from the peculiar covenant made with the descendants of

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

It is not, indeed, affirmed that all the books of the Bible, and all the parts of all the books, are alike necessary to salvation. A breviate of the Bible might be made containing the great essential and fundamental points, which might suffice for a man's salvation. But the inquiring mind of a true believer will find that nothing in the sacred book is impertinent or unedifying, when it is diligently studied and well understood.

It is true, as Chillingworth suggests, that there are many things in the Bible which it is not absolutely necessary for a man to study, or indeed for ministers to teach, in order to salvation—as there are many things in the volume of revelation, as in that of nature, which we shall never understand in this life; but that is no argument against their pertinency or utility. Scientists tell us that milk contains all the elements necessary to nutrition; but it does not follow that a varied vegetable and animal diet might not greatly strengthen and develop our physical powers and, indeed, our mental powers also, by reason of the interdependence of those departments of our complex being.

The critical student of the Bible derives great satisfaction and advantage from the names of persons and places, costumes, scenes, facts, and circumstances, contained in Esther and Canticles—though these books may be, the one a Jewish narrative and the other a love-story—as they vividly portray the manners and customs of the times, corroborate the truth of other portions of the sacred writings, and shed no little light on those providential arrangements which were preparing the way for the appearance of the Saviour of the world.

But will any man pretend that the Holy Scriptures do not of set purpose "show unto us the way of salvation?" No candid student of the Scriptures can deny that this is their grand design. It has been well and tersely said, the Bible has God for its author, truth without any mixture of error for its matter, and *salvation* for its end. Were it otherwise, whatever value might be attached to it, it would be a stupendous failure. The student of medicine would be sadly disappointed if, in a treatise bearing the title of the theory and practice of medicine, he were to find every thing else except a description of the diseases to which the human frame is subject, and the methods by which

they are to be cured. No such disappointment awaits the sin-sick soul who opens this book to acquire "the knowledge of his sickness," and "the knowledge of his cure:"

Laden with guilt, and full of fears,
I fly to thee, my Lord;
And not a glimpse of hope appears
But in thy written word.
The volume of my Father's grace
Does all my grief assuage;
Here I behold my Saviour's face.
Almost in every page.

Does any sinner want to know what has been done to secure his salvation? Let him consult the Old Testament, and he will see the wonderful pre-arrangements for the great salvation. Let him consult the New Testament, and he will see the fulfillment of promise, prophecy, and type in the Incarnation, Ministry, Miracles, Atoning Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Intercession of Christ, and in the Mission and Work of the Holy Spirit, who applies the redemption procured by the Saviour for all our lost, apostate race.

Does he want to know what he must do to be saved? Let him consult the oracles divine, and he will learn by what power he may be enabled to repent of his sins, to believe in his Saviour, and how he may realize salvation, salvation from the guilt, and power, and pollution, and indwelling, and penalty of sin, a free, a full, and an eternal salvation. "To Him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Moses and the Psalms give the same testimony. The Gospels, the Epistles, the Apocalypse, all with uniform testimony, with constant repetition, with earnest emphasis, unite in the declaration, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." (1 Tim. i. 15.) "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." (1 John iv. 14.) "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." (John iii. 16, 17.) "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 12.) "How shall we escape if

we

423

neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. ii. 3.) From Genesis to Revelation, the sacred word proclaims, as it points to Christ:

Salvation in his name is found,
Balm of your grief and care;
A medicine for your every wound—
All, all you want is there!

§ 3. Genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

The Sacred Writings are genuine. It may be said the Bible does indeed treat of salvation; but who knows by whom the sixty-six books called the Holy Scriptures were written? They bear the names of the Jewish lawgiver, sixteen Jewish prophets, and others, by whom the Old Testament is said to have been written; and of eight other Jews, by whom the New Testament is said to have been written; but who knows that they wrote those books? Who knows that those books are not spurious? Who can prove that they are genuine?

In answer to this, it may be said, that if all the sixty-six books of the Bible were anonymous, as some of them are, this would not invalidate their contents. It might have pleased God to inspire men to write them and publish them to the world, and to accredit their statements by supernatural phenomena, as well as by internal evidences of truth and wisdom, and correspondent moral effects upon the hearts and lives of men, without divulging the name of a single writer. On *a priori* grounds, perhaps, this would not be expected; and God did not see proper thus to act. We know the names of all the writers of the New Testament (not noticing the doubts expressed by some concerning one or two of them), and of more than half of the writers of the Old Testament. But how do we know that the men to whom they are ascribed wrote those books? How do we know that Herodotus wrote the history ascribed to him? that Xenophon wrote the Memorabilia? that Virgil wrote the Aeneid? that Caesar wrote the Commentaries on his War in Gaul? We know they wrote those books (1) because they said they did; (2) because they were published at the time as their productions; (3)

because none else claimed their authorship; (4) because all the world since has admitted the fact; and (5) because the contents of those works agree with the character, times, and profession of their respective authors. The books of the Old Testament constituted the national history, the ecclesiastial creed and ritual, the political code and statutes, the

songs and proverbs, the prospective, predicted fortunes of an ancient people, whose descendants still assert the genuineness of these venerable records, and strikingly verify their contents.

These books were written by men of those ancient times; who were they if they were not Moses and the prophets, whose names they bear? the evangelists and apostles to whom they are ascribed? The later writers of the Old Testament frequently and naturally refer the Pentateuch to Moses, the great legislator of their nation. The prophets cite from one another, by name, not dreaming it possible that their works should be branded as spurious. The Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch, made at an early period, ascribes those books to Moses. The Septuagint, or Greek translation of the Old Testament, made centuries before Christ, and deposited in the Alexandrian Library, assigns all the books to their respective authors as in the Hebrew manuscripts. Josephus, the Jewish historian, who lived in the first century of the Christian era, does the same; and so do all other Jewish writers of every age. Ancient heathen writers, as Longinus, Juvenal, Julian, and others, speak of Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. Jesus Christ and the apostles constantly refer to the Pentateuch as written by Moses, and they cite many of the other books of the Old Testament by the names of the authors to whom they are attributed. The Fathers of the Church did the same thing in all their controversies with Jews and heathens, and their correctness was never challenged.

As to the books of the New Testament, they are attributed to the authors whose names they bear, from the date of their publication down through all succeeding ages. Their translation into Syriac, Latin, and other tongues began in the second century, and has continued to the present age.

The Apostolical Fathers, those who were contemporary with the apostles and evangelists, quote their writings frequently and familiarly, without mentioning their names, as it was not necessary so to do. Their successors, the Primitive Fathers, abound in

references to the writings of the New Testament, and frequently give the names of the writers.

Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia, who lived about the time of the death of John the Evangelist, cites the Gospels of Matthew and Mark by name, and alludes to other books of the New Testament.

425

Justin Martyr (A.D. 140) alludes frequently to the Gospels as "Memoirs of the Apostles and their Companions," and quotes from the Acts and many of the Epistles, and says the Revelation of Christ was written by "John, one of the Apostles." Tatian (A.D. 172) composed a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels. Melito (A.D. 170) wrote a Commentary on the Revelation of St. John.

Irenaeus (A.D. 170) bears testimony to every book of the New Testament, except the Epistle to Philemon, 3 John, and Jude. His quotations are very numerous, and some of them are long. He speaks of the "Code of the New Testament as well as of the Old," and calls both "the Oracles of God, and Writings dictated by his Word and Spirit."

Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 200) states the order in which the Four Gospels were written, and quotes all the books of the New Testament often by name, and so amply, says Horne, that his citations would fill a considerable volume. He traveled in quest of information, accurately examined the subject, and thus gave great weight to his testimony.

Tertullian (A.D. 200) distinguishes between Matthew and John as apostles, and Mark and Luke as apostolical men, and asserts that the Four Gospels were inspired, and written by their reputed authors, and acknowledged as authoritative by the Christian Church from their original date. His works abound in quotations by name from all the books of the New Testament except James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.

About this time Julius Africanus wrote a work to reconcile the apparent contradictions in the genealogies of Jesus Christ by Matthew and Luke. Ammonius composed a Harmony of the Four Gospels. Hippolytus refers to most of the books of the New Testament, and particularly to John's Gospel. Caius Romanus quotes all the Epistles of Paul as his genuine works except that to the Hebrews, the genuineness of which was universally questioned for awhile by the Western Church.

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, quotes copiously from almost all the books of the New Testament. Gregory, Bishop of Neo-Cesarea, and Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, bear numerous testimonies of a similar kind.

Origen (A.D. 185–253) wrote voluminous commentaries and homilies on all the books of Scripture. He gives a catalogue of

the books of the New Testament, as we receive them. Victorinus, a Bishop in Germany, who came after Origen, wrote commentaries on certain books of the Old Testament and on the Apocalypse, with an exposition of some passages in Matthew: he makes explicit reference to almost every book of the New Testament.

Eusebius (A.D. 315) received the books of the New Testament nearly as we have them, and quotes from all or nearly all of them. In the third book of his Ecclesiastical History he treats on the various books of the New Testament and others, and divides them into these classes. 1. *Homologoumenai Graphai*—writings which were universally received as the genuine works of those whose names they bear, e. the Four Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, and perhaps the Revelation. 2. *Antilegomenai Graphai*—writings which were not unanimously received as genuine, *e. g.*, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and perhaps Revelation. But Eusebius says the majority recognized them as genuine. He then specifies other writings which were confessedly spurious and some absurd and impious, which are contrasted with the Holy Scriptures.

Jerome (A.D. 392) revised the Latin version of the New Testament, which contains the books as we have them. He says that most persons in the Latin Church did not consider Paul the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though he himself did. The witnesses to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament in the fourth century, says Home, are very numerous—we have not fewer than ten distinct catalogues. Six agree exactly with our present canon, namely, the lists of Athanasius (A.D. 315), Epiphanius (A.D. 370), Jerome (A.D. 392), Rufinus (A.D. 390), Augustin (A.D. 394), and the forty-four Bishops in the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397). Of the other four catalogues, those of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 340), of the Bishops at the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), and of Gregory of Nazianzus (A.D. 375), are the same with our canon, only the Revelation is omitted. Philarte, Bishop of Brescia (A.D. 380), omits Hebrews and Revelation from his list, though he acknowledges both

these books in other parts of his works.

The ancient heretics bear important testimony to the genuineness of these books. Cerinthus, who was contemporary with

John the Evangelist, discarded the Epistles of Paul because they opposed his heresies: he thereby proves their genuineness. He received the Gospel of Matthew, because he did not consider it hostile to his tenets.

Marcion, in the beginning of the second century, who had traveled much, bore testimony to the genuineness of these books, though he absurdly thought that the Gospel of Matthew, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistles of Peter and James, as well as the Old Testament, were for Jews, not Christians!

Dr. Lardner says: "Noetus, Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, Marcellus, Photinus, the Novatians, Donatists, Manicheans, Priscillianists, besides Artemon, the Audians, the Arians, and divers others, all received most or all of the same books of the New Testament which the Catholics received; and agreed in the same respect for them, as being written by apostles, or their disciples and companions."

The Jewish and heathen adversaries of Christianity bear irrefragable testimony to the genuineness of the New Testament. The Talmud abounds with references to it, and Chrysostom remarks that Celsus and Porphyry are powerful witnesses for the antiquity of the New Testament, since they could not have argued against the tenets of the gospel if it had not existed in that early period. Celsus lived in the second century. He quoted from the books of the New Testament by name; and especially from the Four Gospels, which he says were altered by the Christians, alluding probably to the heretical sects of the Marcionites, Valentinians, and others.

Porphyry lived in the third century. He was the acutest and most severe adversary of the Christians, yet he never once charged upon them that their sacred books were spurious. He indeed considered the miracles which they record of Christ as real facts. Julian, the Apostate, lived in the fourth century. He cites the Four Gospels and the Acts, by name, and never questions their genuineness, though he disclaims their authority. The enemies of Christianity in those early ages had too much sagacity to confound the genuine works of the apostles and evangelists with those contemptible forgeries which in after times assumed their names.

The spuriousness of these works can be shown by evidence external and internal, as readily as the genuineness of the books of the New Testament—and the contrast

furnishes the demonstration of both the one and the ether. In looking at them, thus contrasted, we are forced to say of these spurious works:

> Great God, if once compared with thine,
> How mean their writings look!

The foregoing positive testimonies to the genuineness of the sacred books cannot be set aside by any counter testimony, as there can be no lie against the truth—no possibility of proving that false which has been demonstrated to be true.

After examining all the objections to the genuineness of these books we find nothing of any weight. How can there be? There are the books, there they have been, thirty-nine of them, for centuries before the Christian era, uniformly attributed to the authors whose names they bear, and none others ever disputed their title. The other twenty-seven have been recognized for eighteen centuries, that is from the time when they were written, as the productions of the eight apostles and evangelists whose names they bear. What folly, what madness, at this late hour, to dispute their genuineness!

In some of the most ancient of these books—*e. g.*, the Pentateuch—there are occasionally glosses interpolated by later hands, as Gen. xxxvi. 31; Exod. xvi. 35, 36; Deut. iii. 14; xxxiv.; as there are a few glosses of the kind in the New Testament, as the doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 13; and 1 John v. 7, in the received text; and a number of various readings in the hundreds of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and versions. But what has that to do with the subject? Nobody doubts that Virgil wrote the Aeneid, because the copies of that epic abound in various readings. Does any one expect God to work a [perpetual] miracle to secure the correctness of every copy of the Scriptures in the original and in the hundreds of versions into which they have been rendered, in manuscript and in print? Indeed these numerous various readings attest the genuineness of the Holy Scriptures.

Chapter II. Authenticity of the Holy Scriptures.

429
The Sacred Writings are authentic. As a book may be authentic without being genuine, so a book may be genuine without being authentic. But our sacred books are both genuine and authentic. They are what they profess to be, divine oracles, not cunningly devised fables.

I. Presumptions in Favor of Authenticity.

§ 1. Revelation (1) Necessary, (2) Possible, (3) Probable.

1. It is reasonable to suppose that God would give the world a knowledge of the way of salvation.

This is necessary, as it is impossible for man to make the discovery by his own unassisted powers. “The world by wisdom knew not God.” The works of nature shed no light on this great problem.

> The stars that in their courses roll
> Have much instruction given.

But they say not a syllable about sin and salvation. Astronomy, geology, chemistry (which lay open the arcana of nature), philosophy (rational and moral), all, all, are dumb. They give no response, at least no satisfactory, truthful response, to the momentous question, “How shall man be just with God?” Zendavesta, Veda, Koran, and all the rest, are but *ignes fatui.* They flare out their flickering lights, only to dazzle, bewilder, and allure to the quagmires of error and doubt and despair.

Plato himself warned his disciples not to expect anything beyond a probable conjecture concerning these things, unless some god should reveal them. So Cicero: “Nature has given us only some small sparks of right reason, which we so quickly extinguish with corrupt opinions and evil practices, that the true light of nature nowhere appears.” Speaking of the opinions of philosophers in regard to the immortality of the soul, he says: “Which of these

opinions is true, some god must tell us." Iamblichus, another representative man of antiquity, says, "Those

430

things are to be done which are pleasing to God; but it is not easy to know what they are, unless a man were taught them by God himself, or by some one who had received them from God, or obtained the knowledge of them by some divine means." (Life of Pythagoras 28.) But it is useless to pursue this subject.

> We are not left to nature's voice
> To bid us know the Lord—

or, like our forefathers, who worshiped Thor and Woden, we should ourselves painfully illustrate, by our ignorance and superstition and abominable idolatry, the necessity of a divine revelation.

2. Such a divine communication is possible. No theist can deny this. Atheists, materialists, and the whole tribe of agnostics, of course, deny the possibility of any divine oracles; as, in their account, there is no Divinity to utter them. But admit that there is a God in the universe, and a spirit in man which renders him "capable of God"—that is, of knowing, loving, serving, and enjoying his Creator—then it is absurd to deny the possibility of such a divine interposition. Even Bolingbroke, infidel as he was, could say, "An extraordinary action of God upon the human mind, which the word inspiration is now used to denote, is not more inconceivable than the ordinary action of mind on body, or of body on mind."

Surely the Being of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, who made man, can reveal himself to the creature that he has made, as he made him in his own image. Surely, man thus fearfully and wonderfully made, with senses, intellect, sensibility, and will, is subjectively capable of comprehending any phenomena by which God might see proper to have communication with the intelligent, moral, responsible, and immortal creatures whom he has created, whom he preserves, and who are the subjects of his moral government. We know how, by gesture, voice, and writing, to communicate our ideas to one another: God has given us the power so to do; and yet forsooth he has not the power to do the like himself! He can find no medium by which he can make known to us his will, and our duty, interest, and destiny!

3. Such a divine communication is probable. Admit that God created our first parents: is it not highly improbable that he should

create them, and leave them without any knowledge of their Creator and their duty to him?

431

Admit that they fell from their high estate of purity and bliss into sin and misery, from which they are to be rescued by a process of redemption: is it probable that God would give them no information concerning this wonderful arrangement, and their duty in the premises? There is perhaps no man who is capable of reasoning on these subjects who does not think it highly probable that as God can, so he will, inform his favorite creature man concerning his duty and destiny. Indeed, many men raise a doubt as to the existence of God, or his moral government, the redemption of our world, and the obligations of religion, because God did not at first make a full disclosure of these things to men, and so repeat his revelations in every age that not only some may know the way of salvation, but that all men of every race, in every age, and in every clime, *shall* know it. The goodness of God, involving truth, faithfulness, justice, impartiality, as well as benevolence, requires this. The goodness of God does require that a divine revelation should be made to the world, and forbids that any should be held responsible for the obligations which it imposes, but those who are favored with its light. But we are not competent to dictate in what method, to what extent, at what times, this revelation should be made, and how it should be perpetuated in the earth. Analogy suggests that there would be a general manifestation of the will of God made to man, that there should be great epochs in the history of redemption as in every other department of God's government, and that there should not be the constant recurrence of miracles to communicate and authenticate divine revelations to the world from age to age (which would destroy the peculiar marks of miracles), but that men themselves should be employed in the maintenance of the truth when revealed and authenticated, and in its communication to every kindred, tribe, and tongue. This seems reasonable; and it is the very course which God has adopted. "For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children." (Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6.) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark xvi.

§ 2. Ethnic Sacred Books.

432

The necessity, possibility, and probability of a divine revelation being so patent, every nation has produced men who have pretended to be in communication with some supernatural power, at whose dictation they have written books which profess to set forth the will of God, and the duty and destiny of man. It has become somewhat fashionable among writers of the skeptical school to speak of the ethnic religions as on a par with the Jewish and Christian systems—all alike good and trustworthy, or all alike bad and untrustworthy, or all alike a mixture of truth and error, as all alike of mere human origination. It is not denied that in some of these ethnic systems there are elements of truth, beauty, and utility. There are many such in the Zendavesta, the Vedas, the Koran. There are many fragments of primeval revelations mingled with the puerile mythologies and vain speculations and gross immoralities found in those systems. Mohammed, in particular, derived all the sublime utterances of the Koran concerning God from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. But we venture the assertion that there is not a sane, ingenuous inquirer after the way of salvation that would hesitate for a moment in rejecting Zend, Vedas, Koran, and all other ethnic systems, as foolish speculations, absurd fables, and impudent impostures, alike unworthy of God and man.

On the other hand, no one can deny that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments not only make fair professions, but appear to be written with the finger of God and to bear the royal seals of divine authentication. They profess to furnish us exactly what we need. No man is true to himself, true to the instincts of his moral nature, true to the impulses of the Divine Spirit, who does not search the Scriptures daily to see what they teach, and who does not carefully and candidly canvass the evidences of their inspiration. Let this be done, and there need be no fear for the result. Rousseau has settled that in his well-known eulogium of the gospel:

> I will confess to you that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the gospel has its influence on my heart. Peruse

the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp of diction: how mean, how contemptible are they, compared with the Scriptures! Is it possible that a book at once so simple and sublime should be merely the work of man? Is it possible that the sacred personage whose history it contains should be himself a mere man? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast or ambitious sectary? What

433

sweetness, what purity in his manners! What an affecting gracefulness in his delivery! What sublimity in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind in his replies! How great the command over his passions! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live, and so die, without weakness and without ostentation? When Plato described his imaginary good man with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he described exactly the character of Jesus Christ; the resemblance was so striking that all the Christian Fathers perceived it.

§ 3. The Science of Comparative Religion.

[The Christian Religion explains the religiousness of mankind, and pays respect to the forms in which this has been expressed. St. Paul, the amplest expositor of natural theology, preaches in the Acts, and teaches in the Epistle to the Romans, that the whole world has always been under a divine education: drawn by God's works of creation to contemplate his power, and by the benefits of his providence to consider his goodness, in order that it might thus be prepared for a third revelation which should display both his power and his goodness in redemption. The Apostle, as the leading representative of this argument, professes only lo declare or preach —κατα*γγέλλω* ὑμῖν—the UNKNOWN GOD whom all the world had been ever consciously or unconsciously seeking: that world which is, as Tertullian said of the human spirit, *naturaliter Christianus*. He makes God himself, in a certain sense, the universal "teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity," *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*; and heathenism, like the law, a schoolmaster unto Christ. In other words, this representative of Christianity traces all forms of religious faith and practice among the nations to a yearning for revelation from heaven. And he in fact gives us the argument we now use: the strong presumption from the *consensus gentium*, the consent of all the world, in favor of a communication from God to mankind. . . . All this has taked for granted that the forms of religion always existing in heathenism have possessed certain elements of truth. Otherwise they would be worthless as evidence of a universal aspiration toward communion with Heaven. Whatever strong assertions we may find in the Old and New Testaments of the doctrinal errors and moral abominations of heathenism,

we discern everywhere an acknowledgment of something good lying at their root, of which they are only the perversions. . . . Perhaps almost all the great tribal or national expressions of the feeling after the Infinite have more or less paid their tribute to the unity and supremacy of the One Unknown God, with a dim perception of a plurality in that unity; to the existence of intelligences higher than man, as it were between God and man, this notion being disguised in a thousand ways, from Polytheism down to the personification of all the forces of nature; to the degradation of man himself through a fall, and the universality of sin as personal guilt and liability to punishment; to a mysterious Deliverer desired of the nations; to the sense of the necessity and acceptableness of worship by sacrifice; in the ethical domain to the rights of the Right and the goodness of the Good; to the inextinguishable hope of immortality, more distorted perhaps than almost any other truth. Now it is a credential of the Christian revelation that it acknowledges all this; or rather that all this is true. . . . It appears to many students of what may be called Comparative Theology that the existence of so many other religions, containing so many noble and uncontested truths, is a bar to the

acceptance of Christianity as the one definitive revelation of God. They deny the distinction between natural religion and supernatural, between natural theology and revealed. They assert that all the faiths or mythologies of mankind are natural or supernatural alike, according as these words are understood. All are supernatural in the sense that the Creator has lodged in the spirit of man a faculty for the Infinite, which has developed in a few great historical religions; just as the Creator gave man a supernatural endowment of language, which has been developed into a few great families of speech. All are natural, in the sense that all have their natural pedigree, and may be traced through the various nationalities as, equally with language, and perhaps more than language, the foundation of race distinctions. Hence the science of religion distinguishes in various ways the religions of mankind. There are the religions which should be traced to individual founders: such as Moses, Zoroaster, Buddha, Confucius, Lao-tse, Christ, and Mohammed. And there are those which are national, and have never been connected with human names: the religions of the ancient Brahmans, the Greeks, Romans, Teutons, Slavs, and Celts. Again we have the faiths which have sacred books and those which are without them: of the former eight being reckoned, Brahmanism and Buddhism among the Hindoos; Zoroastrianism among the Persians; among the Hebrews, Mosaism and Christianity; among the Arabs, Mohammedanism; among the Chinese, Confucianism and the religion of Lao-tse. These distinctions rise at last into the division of two or three great families. First, the Aryan, subdivided into the Brahmanism of the Veda, Buddhism which sprang from it and revolted against it, and Zoroastrianism, which departed from the ancient Vedic faith.

Secondly, the Semitic, with its Old and New Testament religions, the latter transferred, however, into Aryan soil; and Mohammedanism. These have played the most distinguished part in the history of the world hitherto; but a third must be added, the Turanian, to which the branches of Chinese religion belong. The argument deduced from the study of comparative theology is simply this: that there is not one religion which is of divine right, and must needs be separated from all the rest. In plain words, whatever other distinctions there are—between Monotheistic and Polytheistic, Documentary and Traditional, Cultivated and Fetish—this distinction between true and false religions is not to be allowed. There is no final, definite, supreme religion for mankind, any more than there is one universal language for mankind. This science, which is comparatively new, makes a fair show of zeal for all religions; and, indeed, most triumphantly vindicates the truth, depth, and universality of the Godward tendency in our nature. But this is at the expense of Christianity, however seemingly on its side. In fact it takes away all the strength of the credential now under consideration, so far as it concerns Christianity, while leaving it in its full force so far as it concerns revelation generally, or the religion of nature. What then is to be said in defense of our argument?

First and foremost, the science of religions pays too much honor to the faiths of the world when it brings Christianity into conjunction or comparison with them. After allowing all that the catholic Apostle asserts as to the religiousness of mankind—our argument has done justice to that —we must not forget his dark testimony against the outward forms of that religiousness. “The world by wisdom knew not God.” Comparative theology collects a number of sublime sayings about God to which Hindoo devotion gave birth; but it is undeniable that the system of

Brahmanism was at almost all points a gigantic parody on the religion of supernatural revelation. Attempt after attempt from age to age was made to reform it; but its greatest reformation, that of Buddhism—now one of the most extensively held faiths in the world—was and is in reality a religion without a God: the vastest waste of atheism that has ever been known. Christianity is not one of the religions of the world: responding, like others, to the common instinct, only in bolder and sublimer terms. Once more, Christianity is not what the science of religions makes it: an offshoot from Mosaism, and an improvement on it, as Buddhism rose out of the old Vedic faith and put away its old gods. It is the one only religion that the world has ever received directly from heaven. In its present form, and with its present name, it originated in the midst of Judaism, at a certain epoch, and struggled for and won its ascendency. . . . But Christianity, as Divine Revelation, is only the consummate form of a truth, or a system of truths, that has been in the world from the beginning of human history.[1]]

§ 4. Anticipations Concerning the Character of a Divine Revelation.

What would any one naturally expect to find in a system devised and revealed by God? The question is somewhat difficult to answer, because of the acknowledged inaptitude of man by nature to judge of such matters. But, not to urge that man has not been left altogether in a state of nature, all men—at least all civilized men—profess to have some conceptions of this subject. In opening a book which professes to be a revelation from God, all men would expect to find in it:

1. *Novelty*: if it reveals nothing new, nothing that the mind of man could not excogitate, *cui bono?* what is the use of the revelation? The word itself is a misnomer. But the very title of the work, the Gospel, means *news, good news,* glad tidings of great joy for all people: and its disclosures vindicate its title.
2. He would expect to find *mystery* in it—divine problems, solved or insoluble. No one could believe in a God or in a religion that he could fully comprehend. There must be mysteries in religion which the finite mind of man cannot solve, and which cannot be fully explained to him in this life. That is precisely the character of the Holy Scriptures. Enough is revealed to mark out our duty; enough is concealed to excite our hope. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but there is revealed to us a future state where we shall know even as we are known.
3. He would expect to find *sublimity* in a system which comes

from God, and speaks of God, of the soul of man and its immortal destiny. The Bible is full of sublimity, both of matter and style. Its first announcements are so sublime—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; And God said, Let there be light, and there was light"—that Longinus, a heathen, cited it in his work on the Sublime, as a passage wonderful in its sublimity. That the doctrines are sublime beyond parallel or conception, all must admit.
4. So of *beauty*: an inquirer after truth, acquainted with the works of God, would expect to find beauty in the Word of

God. He will find it in all its perfection in the Holy Scriptures. "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined."

5. So of *simplicity*. This characterizes the works of God in nature; one would naturally expect it in revelation. It is there. While there are depths in which an elephant may swim [as an ancient writer suggested], there are shallows in which a lamb may wade. What is necessary to salvation is so plain that "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." Besides, in revelation as in nature, we see the grandest results, and the most varied, produced by the simplest means: a strong mark of divinity.
6. Then there is *consistency*: one would expect to find that in a system of divine revelation. It cannot be found in Koran, Veda, or Zendavesta; they are all bundles of contradictions. They contradict themselves, contradict one another, contradict all the reasonable notions which any one has of God and of man. But the Bible, while it contradicts all opposing systems, as truth must antagonize error, is perfectly consistent with itself. One writer never contradicts another. The New Testament is in perfect harmony with the Old. Neither contains any thing contrary to the divine character or any thing which does not agree with the character of man. Even in all subordinate and collateral matters of history, chronology, ethnography, topography, sociology, and the like, the Scriptures are perfectly consistent with themselves, with all other trustworthy records, and with all the phenomena and facts that are now patent to our observation. What they say of fallen human nature is abundantly verified in the history and present condition of our race. What they say of ancient nations is confirmed by secular historians and by the wonderful discoveries in the lands of the Bible. How emphatically is this true in regard to those regions which were the

scenes of the wonders which accompanied the giving of the law and the introduction of the gospel!

7. A rational, serious inquirer after truth would expect to find *purity* in a system devised and revealed by a holy God. He cannot find this in other systems. They, like the gods which they proclaim, are earthly, sensual, devilish—

Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, or lust.

Infidels, indeed, sometimes object to the Bible that it is not good enough for them: it inculcates impurity and gross immorality. But that is all a sham. They hate the Bible because it exacts purity of heart and life. It portrays sin in order to expose its deformity and to denounce it. It is one great commentary on our Lord's beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," and the communication of his apostle, "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (Matt. v. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.) As there is not an organ or function of the body that is not designed and adapted to promote the welfare of the physical frame, so there is not a principle, precept, or promise in all the Bible that does not tend to moral purity and perfection. "Thy word is very pure; therefore thy servant loveth it." (Ps. cxix. 140.)

8. We hardly know whether an inquirer after truth would expect to find the element of *power* in, or connected with, a divine revelation. But if he should expect to find it in the Holy Scriptures, he will not be disappointed. There is power in truth, of every sort. Knowledge is power. Ideas have a germinating power. The subjects discussed in the Scriptures are surpassing in importance, and the manner in which they are presented invests them with great power over the sincere student. In this respect there is a majesty and grandeur in the Scriptures which cannot be found in other writings, say, those of the Fathers, who were contemporaries of the eight writers of the New Testament. But if their writings were inspired by the Holy Spirit, it seems reasonable to suppose that he would apply his own truth to the mind of every honest inquirer, so that a superhuman power shall be realized; an efficacious energy be brought to bear upon the intellect, sensibility, and will, which will force conviction of the

truth, arouse a desire for its realization, and present such considerations and afford such extraneous assistance as will

result in a determination to accept the principles, obey the precepts, and claim the promises revealed in the Holy Scriptures, in every case where there is not a stubborn resistance to their self-evidencing truth and the accompanying influences of their Divine Author.

As therefore we need a divine revelation, as we can find no other that suits our case, as this contains all the elements that might reasonably be expected in a divine system, and as millions have examined it, subjected it to all possible tests, and pronounced it true, it betrays inexcusable indolence, prejudice, or contumacy in us to disregard its claims.

§ 5. The Presumptions Imply Written Revelation.

But the presumptions in favor of a divine revelation extend also to its commitment to writing. No one would intrust an important communication, designed for all men, and all time, to uncertain oral tradition. Everybody knows how untrustworthy are all unwritten anecdotes and *memorabilia*. How few of the reputed sayings and acts of Moses and the prophets, of Christ and the apostles, outside of the Scriptures, have come down to our times! and there is not one of them entitled to credit! We should therefore naturally expect that if God revealed his will to prophets and evangelists, he would instruct them not only to make oral communications of them to the people of their own age, but also to commit them to writing, under the infallible superintendence of the same Power by whom they were revealed. Unless a constant miracle were wrought to keep the truth alive in the world, and to preserve it unalloyed with error, its commitment to writing is the only conceivable method by which this end can be secured. We know not how the primitive patriarchal revelations were preserved, whether by repeated miraculous communications, which might answer in view of the longevity of the patriarchs, or by writing: perhaps by both. But when God gave the law to Moses he wrote it on two tables of stone, which were laid up in the ark, as the authentic autograph and infallible exemplar. But copies were made in books, and inscribed on monuments, and repeated in every age. All the moral, ceremonial, and political laws of the theocracy were

committed to writing, all the predictions of the prophets that were

of permanent importance, and so all the psalms and songs and proverbs and histories which were designed to go down to posterity were by God's command, and under the superintendency of the Spirit, committed to writing. So the account of the life of Christ, his ministry, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension, the establishment of the Church, the Acts of the Apostles, and their teachings—such as were of permanent importance—were in like manner committed to writing. That they were written at the times and by the writers whose names they bear, we have already seen; that they spoke and wrote by divine inspiration they themselves assert. Now this precisely agrees with what we should have expected in the premises. We do not look to tradition, but to Scripture, for our religion. This is a strong presumption in its favor.

§ 6. The Character of the Sacred Writers.

There is another presumption immediately connected with it: the characters of the writers favor the truth of what they have written. Some of them, as Moses, Ezekiel, Daniel, and several other writers of the Old Testament, and the Apostle Paul, one of the principal writers of the New Testament, were men of varied culture and of high social position. But they all profess to receive their knowledge of divine things from a supernatural source; and it is evident that without divine aid they could not have written the works attributed to them. Others of the prophets and apostles were plain men—as the Jewish priests said, "unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts iv. 13), that is, mere laymen, unversed in the learning of the schools—yet what a majesty is there in their writings! How sublime are their communications! Could uninstructed herdsmen and fishermen so write if they were not divinely aided?

Then again, it must be borne in mind that they professed to receive their doctrines by revelation and inspiration: they affirmed that they were well acquainted with the facts which they narrate, as one of them says, "That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you." (1 John i. 3.) They were not likely to be deceived. Moses knew whether he twice spent forty days in the mount receiving the law from God and whether the prodigies which he records, as part

of the events, took place. The apostles knew whether they had spent three years with Jesus, witnessing his ministry and miracles, his death, resurrection,

and ascension, and whether they received the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, and performed miracles in attestation of their apostleship. They either told the plain, unvarnished truth, or they were the greatest hypocrites and liars that ever trod the earth! As they could not be deceived themselves, so they had no motive to deceive others. Their testimony brought them into conflict with priestly rage, philosophic scorn, popular fury, and imperial power, so that, as their Master told them, they shared his fortunes: they were slandered, abused, persecuted, imprisoned, put to death, and yet, in the face of all this, they never flinched, or flagged, or faltered; but uniformly replied to their persecutors, who ordered them to desist: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." (Acts iv. 19, 20.) They never varied in their testimony. The law of Moses is in perfect correspondence with the Psalms and the Prophets. There is no doctrine in the Acts and Epistles that is not found in the Gospels. Paul never contradicts Peter: Peter bears testimony to Paul, ranking his writings with "the other Scriptures." (2 Pet. iii. 16.) There is an agreeable diversity in the style of the sacred writings, but there is no contradiction in any of their statements; they constitute a perfect *consensus*. We admit that there may be an agreement in error, and fanatics may die in its support. But the world cannot furnish such an agreement as that which characterizes all the statements of the sixty-six books of the Holy Scriptures, extending over fifteen hundred years, and relating to matters on which the writers could have had, in many instances, no personal correspondence. Yet there is a perfect agreement from beginning to end. The apparent contradictions, yielding as they have yielded to patient investigation, only serve the more to illustrate their perfect consistency and consequent truth. As they were not fanatics—for they evidently speak the words of truth and soberness—the services which they performed, and the sacrifices which they made, including their lives, not only evince their sincerity, but also furnish strong presumptions of their divine legation.

II. Proofs of Authenticity: Revelation and Inspiration.

There are pregnant proofs of the authenticity of the Holy
441
Scriptures closely articulated with the strong presumptions which we have considered.

§ 1. Revelation and Inspiration Defined and Discriminated.

The writers declare that they received much of what they wrote by revelation, and wrote all they wrote by inspiration. By revelation is meant a communication made to man personally and directly by God himself, as to Adam, Abraham, Moses, and others, or by the Incarnate Word, or by the ministry of angels, as to patriarchs, prophets, and apostles. By inspiration is meant an influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind of a man by which he is infallibly instructed in divine truth, and enabled to reproduce it orally or by writing, without the possibility of mistake.

William Lee, in his great work on Inspiration (Lecture I.) thus makes the contrast:

> By revelation I understand a direct communication from God to man, either of such knowledge as man could not of himself attain to, because its subject matter transcends human sagacity or human reason (such, for example, were the prophetical announcements of he future, and the peculiar doctrines of Christianity), or which (although it might have been attained in the ordinary way) was not, in point of fact, from whatever cause, known to the person who received the revelation. By inspiration, on the other hand, I understand that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, in whatever degree or manner it may have been exercised, guided by which the human agents chosen by God have officially proclaimed his will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.

Mr. Lee's definition of inspiration would have been better if he had embodied in it the element of infallibility. "The actuating energy of the Holy Spirit" must go so far as to infallibly instruct its subject in divine truth, so as to make it not only possible for him not to mistake, but to make it not possible for him to mistake.

§ 2. The Sacred Writers Organs of Divine Revelation.

Now the sacred writers declare that they received much of what they have committed to writing by divine revelation. Moses says positively and repeatedly that God revealed to him, by direct communication, all the laws, moral, ceremonial, and political, of the Hebrew theocracy. It is useless to cite examples; the Pentateuch is full of them. Thus we read, Exod. xxxiii. 11: “The Lord spake unto Moses, face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend.” Num. xii. 6–8: “If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision,

and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches.” None of the principles, precepts, or promises of the Old Dispensations were originally given by inspiration, but by revelation.

Jesus, as the Oracle of the Father, received from him his entire system of developed religious truth, which we call emphatically the Christian religion. As the Divine Revealer he communicated the knowledge thereof directly, and formally, and authoritatively, and infallibly, to his apostles, who were chosen by him to be the official depositaries and proclaimers of the same. He left no dogma to be supplied by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by the authority of apostles, by the process of development, by the decrees of councils, by the bulls of popes. The system, as made over to the apostles by their Master, was perfect. It was the faith once—ἅπαξ, once for all—delivered unto the saints. There is not a doctrine inculcated in the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse that is not contained in the Gospels. When a new apostle was to be chosen, one who had not “companied with” the apostles, as Matthias had, “all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among” them (Acts i. 21), he was not relegated to the college of apostles to get from them his knowledge of Christianity, nor was he merely inspired by the Holy Spirit with this knowledge; but he received it by direct revelation. Paul lays great stress upon this in magnifying his office, as an apostle, not inferior in dignity, authority, and knowledge to any of his colleagues. Thus he says, 1 Cor. xi. 23: “For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.” He specifies the

institution of the Lord's Supper, the account of which is given, with even more particularity than by Matthew, who was present on the solemn occasion. But he did not get the account from Matthew or any other apostle, but from Christ himself. So in his apology to the Galatians, he says: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. But when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood"—consulted with no man about it—"neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles

before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ; but they had heard only, that he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me. Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." (Gal. i.; ii.) This is a remarkable passage. With what earnestness and emphatic repetition does Paul assert his independent, original apostolate. He received his orders directly from Christ. He was no catechumen of Peter or of James, for he had no interview with them for three years after his call to the apostolate, and then he was with them only fifteen days. Fourteen more years elapsed before he had any familiar intercourse with the apostles and the mother Church at Jerusalem; and then he went to them "by revelation:" not to receive the gospel from them, but to communicate it to them, that they might have certain proof that "his gospel," as he calls it—that which he preached to the Gentiles —was the same which they had received and which they preached in Jerusalem, but which he received by direct revelation from the Lord. When did he receive it? He told Agrippa when, to-wit, on his way to Damascus, when the Lord Jesus arrested him: "And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou

persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me. Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." (Acts xxvi. 15–19.) All this is very different

from his own personal study of the Old Testament, and developing therefrom the Christian system, which is mapped out in it, very different from theological training in the college of apostles, and very different too from the secret, inward inspiration of the Holy Spirit. During his retreat in Arabia he may have had many revelations made to him by the Lord. About ten or twelve years after he received his commission he had some extraordinary "visions and revelations of the Lord;" and he intimates that he had "abundance of" such "revelations." (2 Cor. xii.) We need not wonder, therefore, at Paul's proficiency in Christian theology, nor be at a loss to know how he acquired his knowledge.

The last book in the Bible is called emphatically *The Revelation*: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw." (Rev. i. 1, 2.) In the perusal of this wonderful book we find revelations of all sorts—voices, visions, epiphanies of the glorified Saviour, ministrations of angels—all at least as subjectively real to the evangelist as the phenomena of nature are objectively real to our senses.

§ 3. Province of Inspiration.

These revelations were absolutely infallible. Those to whom they were made were certain of them. There was no possibility of doubt. But if the matter stopped at this point, the revelations in course of time, and that a very short time, would lose their value;

they would fade from the memory. Something would be lost, some truth or fact would be omitted, some error or misstatement would be interwoven, were there not provisions made for the infallible transmission and perpetuation of those revelations.

Here is the province of inspiration. Those to whom the revelations were made, or others, were infallibly inspired to reproduce them orally when occasion demanded, and to commit them to writing for the benefit of all future ages. All such revelations as are of permanent importance, relating to the great principles of religion, were thus by inspiration written for our edification. Inspiration was given for other purposes, but this is its grand intent.

§ 4. The Sacred Writers Claim Inspiration.

445

The sacred writers claim inspiration for themselves and for one another. One would not expect to find a frequent assertion of this in the writings of men who were consciously inspired. This would engender doubt, rather than secure confidence. The sacred writers speak freely and naturally, and as occasion serves, of their divine commission and inspiration. Moses, Joshua, Samuel, and the prophets generally, state that they received their communications from the Lord and spoke and wrote them by his authority and assistance. (Ex. iii. 14; xxiv. 4–7; Josh. i. 5, 9; xxiv. 2; 1 Sam. iii. 20, 21.) The books of all the prophets are composed almost entirely of direct messages from the Lord. Hence Christ and the apostles speak familiarly of the Scriptures, the Holy Scriptures, as the infallible test of truth and the standard of authority. (Mark xii. 36; Luke i. 70; xxiv. 44, 45; John v. 39; Acts xvii. 2, 11; xxviii. 25; Rom. i. 2; iii. 2; xv. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; 2 Tim. iii. 15–17; Heb. v. 12; 2 Pet. i. 21.) These passages and many more of a similar kind affirm that the Scriptures of the Old Testament were written by the command of God, and by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. But the two great classical texts usually cited in proof of their inspiration are 2 Tim. iii. 15–17 and 2 Pet. i. 19–21 [and to these we proceed to give a critical examination].

§ 5. Critical Examination of 2 Tim. iii. 15–17.

In 2 Tim. iii. 15–17, Paul says to Timothy: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

There can be no question that *theopneustos* means "divinely inspired." The word comes from θεός, God, and πνέω, to breathe, and means breathed or inspired by God, divinely inspired. But there is much needless controversy over the construction of verse 16. The substantive verb, as usual, is omitted; and the question arises, Is it to be supplied after γραφή and also after καί as in our translation? or is it to be supplied only before καί, rendered "also," or omitted? Most of the old English versions follow the

Vulgate in thus rendering it: *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad docendum.* Rheims: "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach." Wycliffe: "For al Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teche." Tyndale and Cranmer: "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable to teach." Geneva and Tomson's Beza differ from the preceding: "For the whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," etc. Whitby renders the καί, also: "All Scripture being inspired of God, is also profitable." This gives the sense of the common version, as it affirms inspiration of all Scripture. Grotius: "All divinely inspired Scripture is even profitable, or is certainly profitable." Some adopt this rendering to embrace the New Testament, as well as the Old, which is meant in verse 15. Others adopt it, or the rendering, "Every divinely inspired writing is profitable," in order to exclude some of the Scriptures as not inspired. Semler and many other German divines adopt this view, as it furnishes a test of inspiration. Is the passage useful? then it may be inspired; otherwise it is not. A rare test! But this could not be Paul's meaning, as by divinely inspired Scripture here he means the same as "the holy Scriptures" in the preceding verse, where no such distinction is admissible.

Dr. Knapp adopts the rendering, "being inspired." He says it is

“for θεόπνευστος οὖσα, according to Clemens of Alexandria, Theodoret, the Syriac version, the Vulgate, and nearly all the theologians of the sixteenth century; otherwise the article must be inserted before γραφή, and the comma after it be retained. All inspired Scripture (no part of it excepted) is also profitable for instruction (in the Christian religion), for conviction (confutation of errors), for improvement, and for discipline in virtue or piety.” But the article may have been omitted because πᾶσα is used to denote every individual part of the “holy Scriptures,” spoken of in verse 15. Thus Middleton:

When πᾶς or ἅπας in the singular number is used to signify that *the whole* of the thing implied by the substantive with which it is joined is intended, the substantive has the article; but when it is employed to denote that *every individual* of that species is spoken of, then the substantive is anarthrous.

On this place he says:

This is one of the texts usually adduced in support of the inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures; but it has been doubted whether the rendering of the English version is the true one. Some of the ancient versions, with a few of the Fathers,

would omit καί, and thus join θεόπνευστος immediate concord with πᾶσα γραφή. In this, however, they are not supported by a single manuscript still extant. Besides, it is much more easy to perceive why καί does not appear in these ancient versions than how, supposing it not to have been in the earliest manuscripts, it found its way into those which remain; for a translator who had understood θεόπνευστος as agreeing immediately with πᾶσα γραφή, as was the case with the Syriac, might find it difficult to express καί, which, indeed, even in the original would thus have little meaning; on the other hand, and for the same reason, if καί had been wanting in the autograph, as its introduction could tend only to embarrass the sense, it could hardly be interpolated, and still less retained, by the consent of all the transcribers. Mr. Wakefield remarks that the “Ethopic alone of the old versions does not omit καί, and that the Ethopic is with him equivalent to all the rest in a difficult or disputed passage.” Notwithstanding this declaration, Mr. Wakefield, without assigning any reason, renders in defiance of the Ethopic, “Every writing inspired by God *is* useful,” etc. I agree with him, however, in his translation of πασα γραφή, and I take the assertion to be “Every writing (viz., of the ἱερὰ γράμματα just mentioned) is divinely inspired, and is useful,” etc. I do not recollect any passage in the New Testament in which two adjectives apparently connected by the copulative were intended by the writer to be so

unnaturally disguised. He who can produce such an instance will do much toward establishing the plausibility of a translation which otherwise must appear, to say the least of it, to be forced and improbable.

This judicious note of the learned critic is valuable, and his rule in regard to πᾶς anarthrous is sustained by Winer, Robinson, and others. Thus Webster and Wilkinson:

Every Scripture, every portion of the collection known as ἱερὰ γράμματα. The form of the sentence is similar to 1 Tim. iv. 4. Some, however, consider θεόπνευστος here as the attributive of γραφή, and would render the passage, "Every inspired Scripture is also profitable." But this rendering does great violence to the form of the sentence, and the apostle's line of argument. The apostle has enforced his exhortation to Timothy to cleave to the holy Scriptures by ascribing to them the loftiest of all powers, as able to make him wise unto salvation. Lest he might be charged with ascribing too much to them, he reminds Timothy that in the ἱερὰ γράμματα every portion, πᾶσα γραφή, is θεόπνευστος, and is thus profitable, etc. The purposed result marked by "that the man of God may be perfect" is dependent on both the predicates, but more especially belongs to θεόπνευστος, conveying the strongest reason possible for the exhortation, "Continue thou in the things thou hast learned." With πᾶσα γραφή we may compare πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, 2 Pet. i. 20. It must be remembered that though θεόπνευστος means that the writer of each record is guided by divine inspiration, yet it does not follow that every passage expresses a divinely inspired sentiment. We may instance in the friends of Job (Job xlii. 7), the frequent communications of the ungodly, the speech of the town clerk of Ephesus (Acts xix. 25–41), the letter of Lysias (Acts xxiii. 20–30.)

Rotherham renders like those eminent critics, "Every Scripture [is] God-breathed, and profitable." So Glassius: "*Omnis Scriptura est divinitus inspirata et utilis*

," etc. (p. 335). Bloomfield adopts Middleton's view, and says:

There is evidently an ellipsis of ἐστί; but commentators are not agreed whether it should be introduced between γραφή and θεόπνευστος, or between θεόπν. and καί ὠφέλιμος thus joining θεόπν., in immediate concord with πᾶσα γραφή. The latter method is adopted by Theodoret of the ancient, and by many modern commentators from Cameron to Heinrichs and Iaspis—*q. d.*: "All inspired Scripture is also profitable," etc. This, however, is not permitted by the καί, which is found in every existing MS.; and though it does not appear in the Syriac and Vulgate versions, yet, as Bishop Middleton observes, it is far easier to perceive why καί does not appear there than how, supposing it not to have been in the earliest MSS.,

it should have found its way into all those that remain.

That all the ancient versions may as properly be rendered, “The whole of Scripture, which is divinely inspired, is profitable,” as “every Scripture,” etc., is evinced by Dr. Henderson, who observes that “the evidence in favor of the translation in our common English Bible, derived from the Fathers and almost all the Versions, among others the modern Greek, which reads, ὅλη the whole, is most decided.”2 It may farther be observed that

the elliptical ἐστί should not be rendered “is given;” for thus, as Dr. Henderson shows, “a degree of emphasis is attached to the word which it does not possess, and which I would say no elliptical term can have. It is best then to retain the version *is*, meaning *comes*, as the Ethiopic translation freely renders.” Dr. Henderson, in his “Lectures on Divine Inspiration,” says:

> That the Scriptures of the Old Testament are intended is unquestionably the construction best supported by the preceding context. Even on the supposition that no reference had previously been made to any specific writing, or collection of writings, it was most natural for Timothy, who had received an early Jewish education, of which the study of the Scriptures formed a prominent part, to understand the Apostle to mean these Scriptures—γραφή, the term here used in the singular number, being in common use in application to them. He had been taught to regard them as the productions of men who were actuated by the Spirit of God, and who consequently wrote what was agreeable to his will. The very terminology, therefore, independently of any thing else, would at once lead his thoughts to these Scriptures as the collection to which reference was made; but the circumstance that, in the verse immediately preceding, the Apostle had expressly mentioned the “sacred Scriptures” as those which Timothy had known from his earliest age, would seem to place the matter beyond dispute. . . . To say nothing of the awkwardness and total want of point introduced into the passage by giving to the copulative conjunction the signification of *also*, such a mode of construction is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax, which requires that when two adjectives are closely joined, as θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος here are, if there be an ellipsis of the substantive verb ἐστί, this verb must be supplied after the former of the two, and regarded as repeated after the latter. Now there exists precisely such an ellipsis in the case before us; and as there is nothing in the context which would lead us to take any exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force, just as we would in any similar instance.

The word γραφή occurs fifty-one times in the New Testament,

thirty-one times in the singular and twenty times in the plural. In some cases where the plural occurs it refers to particular passages of the Old Testament—*e. g.*, Matt. xxvi. 56; Rom. xvi. 26. When the singular is used in all cases it may, and in most cases it must, refer to particular passages. 2 Pet. i. 20 may seem to be an exception; but the words are πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς (followed by a negative), without the article, and so, according to the rule

cited from Middleton, the passage does not mean "the Scripture" as a whole, but it has the force of an adjective, "every Scripture prophecy," or, as followed by the negative, "no scriptural prophecy is of self-solution."

[As Dr. Summers intimates in beginning his discussion, much of the controversy about this text has been needless, since, with either translation, this passage is doubtless an equally valid proof for inspiration. Dr. Whedon, *in loco*, has this excellent note:

Scholars find two interpretations for this passage. One is clearly expressed in our English translation: *All Scripture is inspired and profitable*, etc. But the verb for *is* not being in the Greek, can be supplied at a different place; and the Greek for *and* can be emphatic *also*. We, then, may have the rendering. *All inspired Scripture is also profitable*, etc. In the former interpretation the inspiration of Scripture is affirmed, in the latter case assumed. Either interpretation is sustainable by the Greek. Ellicott, Alford, and Huther [who writes the commentary on this book in Meyer on the New Testament] prefer the latter; in which they are sustained by Origen, Grotius, Erasmus, Whitby, and Hammond; also by the Syriac, Vulgate, and Luther's version [which, for the most part, has been indicated by Dr. Summers, p. 446]. The latter meaning lies most clearly in the train of thought.

We need not be surprised, therefore, when the Revised Version places in the text "Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable," etc., but adds in the margin the alternative translation, "Every scripture is inspired of God, and profitable," etc. Similarly, President Timothy Dwight, of Yale, in his supplementary notes to Huther in Meyer's Commentary, makes this judicious comment:

The construction of verse 16 adopted by Reused Version, which makes θεόπνευστος a part of the subject and gives to πᾶς the meaning *also*, is probably correct. The decision respecting this point depends mainly on the connection of thought with the preceding verse. That verse assumes the ἱερά character of the γράμματα and predicates of them that they are able to make Timothy wise unto salvation. It is exactly in accordance with this to

regard verse 16 as assuming the θεοπν. character of *every Scripture*, and as affirming that it is useful for the particular ends mentioned, which are all connected with the wisdom unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. The formal statement, that Scripture is inspired, is not demanded by the context, or, apparently, by any thing in Timothy's condition, and it seems antecedently improbable that it would be made to him in such a passage as this, which relates to other subjects more immediately. Paul is not making an emphatic contrast here between the truth and the false teaching, considered in themselves or as to the source from which they come. He is, on the other hand, speaking only of the perfecting of the man of God and the furnishing him thoroughly for every good work. The determination of the question as to the relation of θεοπν. to the sentence does not necessarily affect the teaching of the verse as to inspiration.

451

If the adjective belongs to the subject, it is to be observed that, according to the suggestion of the preceding verse, where ἱερά is a descriptive adjective, it most naturally qualifies πᾶσα γραφή as an attributive word. It covers πᾶσα γραφή, accordingly, and does not mark or distinguish one γραφή in the ἱερὰ γρ. from another. The doctrine of the verse is thus, probably, the same—so far as inspiration is concerned—whichever construction is adopted. The doctrine is distinctly declared, if θεοπν. is a predicate; it is assumed and implied, if θεοπν. is part of the subject.

Huther definitely decides, with Grotius, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, and others, that θεοπν. is attributive, and the καί to be rendered *also*. "There was no doubt on that point (viz., that the *whole* of Scripture and not a part of it was inspired by God), but on the point whether the Scriptures as θεόπνευστος are *also* (καί serves to confirm) ὠφέλιμοι."]

§ 6. Exposition of 2 Peter i. 19–21.

The great classical text on this subject, 2 Pet. i. 19–21, does not directly prove the inspiration of any part of the Scriptures, except the prophetic, as that was all which the Apostle had in view. Having spoken of the glorious advent of Christ, of which he and his companions had received assurance when they witnessed his transfiguration, the Apostle says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came

not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Dr. Knapp thus gives the sense:

Nor could the prophets themselves of the Old Testament give a clear explanation (ἐπιλύσις from ἐπιλύειν *explicare*, Mark iv. 34) of their own oracles, because they had only indistinct conceptions of the subjects on which they spake, and knew only so much as was communicated to them by divine revelation; for no oracle was delivered from the mere will of man (*i. e.*, whether they should speak, and what and how they should speak, did not depend upon the will of the prophets); but the ancient prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The prophets themselves acknowledged that whatever they taught, whether by speaking or writing, was dictated to them by God, or the Divine Spirit, and was published by his command (Ex. iv. 12, 15, 16; Deut. xviii. 18; Jer. i. 6, *seq.*; Amos iii. 7; Isa. lxi. 1). This passage from Peter proves the inspiration only of the prophetical part of the Old Testament, and not, strictly speaking, of the rest. But from the two passages taken together [this and 2 Tim. iii. 14–17] it is obvious that the apostles believed the Old Testament, as a whole, to be inspired. We can

find no evidence in all the New Testament that Christ and his apostles dissented in the least from the opinion commonly received among the Jews on this subject. But the Jews regarded the entire collection of the Old Testament Scriptures as divine. They were frequently called by Josephus and Philo θεῖαι γραφαί, ἱερὰ γράμματα, and always mentioned with the greatest veneration. Divine inspiration (ἐπίπνοια Θεοῦ) is expressly conceded by Josephus to the prophets; and as none but prophets were permitted by the Jews to write their national history, and none but priests to transcribe it (as appears from the same author), we conclude that inspiration was also conceded by him and his contemporaries to their historical books. (*Josephus Contra Apionem*, I. 6, 7, 8.) Such were the prevailing opinions of the Jews of the first and second centuries, and long before the birth of Christ; and to these opinions Christ and his apostles plainly assented; they must therefore be adopted by all who allow Christ and his apostles to be divine preachers.

§ 7. Inspiration Identical in the Two Testaments.

The writers of the New Testament claim for themselves the same inspiration which they predicate of the writers of the Old Testament. Our Lord promised his apostles that they should be endowed with plenary inspiration, that they might be the infallible

conveyancers of the truth.[3] “When they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say; for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.” (Luke xii. 11, 12.) “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come.” (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13.)

Our Lord thus guaranteed to his apostles the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by which they should infallibly recall all his teachings, and be able to predict future events connected with his kingdom on the earth. Accordingly the apostles claimed to possess and to speak and write under this plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, placing their oracles, spoken or written, on a par with those of the ancient prophets. “And we are his witnesses of these things; and so also is the Holy Ghost, whom God

hath given to them that obey him.” (Acts v. 32.) “For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.” (Acts xv. 28.) “Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God: which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13.) “When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God.” (1 Thess. ii. 13.) “Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.” (2 Thess. ii. 15.) “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.” (1 Pet. i. 10–12.) Here Peter claims

for the apostles the same divine inspiration which he affirms of the prophets. “But the word of the Lord endureth forever; and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.” (1 Pet. i. 25.) “Be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour.” (2 Pet. iii. 2.) “Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.” (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.) In this remarkable passage Peter places the writings of Paul on the same ground with those of the Old Testament, and probably the other books of the New Testament which were then extant. He shows too their supreme importance, as the wresting of them results in “destruction.” The Apostle John assumes the same high prerogative. Thus he says in his gospel: “These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of

God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.” (John xx. 31.) He styles the Apocalypse “the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy. . . . I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last; and, what thou seest, write in a book.” (Rev. i. 1–11.) So he begins the Revelation, and thus he closes this wonderful book: “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith. Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord, Jesus. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.” Does not that sound like plenary inspiration? And so in what is considered the “Final

Document of Scripture," the First Epistle General of John: "These things write we unto you, that your joy may be full. This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you." "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. . . . And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen." (1 John i. 4, 5; v. 13–21.) Here the beloved apostle assumes an infallible knowledge of the truth, by divine illumination, and the authority to write the same for the direction and government of all who should read his epistle.

It would be useless to extend this induction. From what has been advanced it is certain the prophets and apostles were the greatest fanatics or impostors that ever lived, if they were not

holy men of God who spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. There are, however, three general theories of inspiration—the rationalistic, the mechanical, and the dynamic—and to these we must now address ourselves.

§ 8. Rationalistic Theory of Inspiration.

The rationalistic theory is hard to define. Indeed, a variety of opinions is comprehended under it, varying from the point where it touches a skeptical rejection of all supernatural influence upon the mind of man, to the point where it touches the true dynamical or scriptural doctrine.

F. W. Newman denies that there can be any authoritative external revelation of moral and religious truth to man. The late Theodore Parker and others have had the same view. There is no divine inspiration, except on pantheistic grounds. If God be only another name for universal nature, and man is a part thereof, then all his elevated conceptions are divine inspirations! Coleridge does not descend as low as that. But as he seemed to know of no other view of inspiration than the mechanical, and as his reason very properly rejected that untenable view, he repudiated all true

inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. He admitted the truth of the Bible, in a general sense, and that God has revealed himself to man, and that the Bible contains divine revelations; but he denied that the sacred writers were infallibly inspired. The influence of his great name and fascinating style was very great and very pernicious. Thus Dr. Arnold writes to Justice Coleridge:

> Have you seen your uncle's "Letters on Inspiration," which I believe are to be published? They are well fitted to break ground in the approaches to that momentous question which involves in it so great a shock to existing notions; the greatest, probably, that has ever been given since the discovery of the falsehood of the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility.

This is a very painful passage. Only think of classing the infallibility of the sacred writers with the infallibility of the Pope, and repudiating both, as alike "falsehood." And that by the great Dr. Arnold! No wonder he so long scrupled to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles and take Orders: the wonder is that he ever overcame his scruples without repudiating his heterodox sentiments.

The theory inculcated by Mr. Morell in his "Philosophy of Religion" is a virtual denial of inspiration. He says: "Revelation

is a process of the intuitional consciousness gazing upon eternal verities." It is merely an inner work on the soul, a process of intuition, not a communication from without, and inspiration denotes the condition of those in whom, through supernatural influences, these intuitions have been clearest and most distinct. This intuitive vision, or elevation of the mind to apprehend spiritual realities, has not been confined to a few men, constituting them the only authorized infallible teachers of the world; but all men in whom these supernatural influences have operated to the quickening of religious thought and sentiment have received, in varying degrees, the same inspiration. He differs very little from his master Schleiermacher, whose pantheism utterly precludes all objective Christianity. He indeed ascribed "normative authority to the New Testament;" but only as it corresponded with his own intuitions and subjective notions of religion, while he maintained that the Old Testament has only an historical significance. It requires no argument to show that on this theory there is neither revelation nor inspiration: nothing has been revealed, nothing has been inspired. If the Bible happen to quadrate with our intuitional consciousness gazing upon eternal verities, under the influence of

supernatural quickenings of religious thought and sentiment, all the better for the Bible; if not, all the worse for the Bible: this certainly makes room for neither inspiration nor revelation.

This theory of inspiration is no better than that of those who maintain that inspiration is simply "that action of the Divine Spirit by which, apart from any idea of infallibility, all that is good in man, beast, or matter is originated and sustained." They say, "It seems to us to be the Bible's own teaching on the subject of inspiration, namely, that every thing good in any book, person, or thing is inspired, and the value of any inspired book must be decided by the extent of its inspiration and the importance of the truths which it well (or inspiredly) teaches. Milton, and Shakespeare, and Bacon, and Canticles, and the Apocalypse, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the eighth chapter to the Romans, are, in our estimation, all inspired; but which of them is the most valuable document, or whether the Bible as a whole is incomparably more precious than any other book, these are questions which must be decided by examining the observable character and tendency of each book, and the beneficial

effect which history may show that each has produced." As the divine influence is exerted throughout the universe—even in hell—it follows from this that every being, angelic, human, diabolical, rational, irrational, inanimate, is inspired, some more, some less, but none with an exclusively authoritative, infallible communication of the divine will to man. This extraordinary notion ignores the patent fact that God energizes throughout the universe in essentially different ways: the inspiration of the sacred writers being a peculiar kind of divine influence, essentially different from all the rest.

Near akin to this extravagant notion, though apparently opposed to it, is the theory that some portions of the Bible are infallibly and authoritatively inspired, but that others are not. This view was vaguely and inconsistently held by some of the primitive Fathers. Thus Origen, who in some places sets forth exaggerated views of inspiration, according to Gieseler, in general appears to understand by inspiration, not the pouring in of foreign thoughts, but an exaltation of the powers of the mind, whereby prophets were elevated to the knowledge of the truth; and this view was held fast in the school of Origen. He held that there are uninspired passages

in the Bible, and distinguished between its divine and its human elements, as in 1 Cor. vii. Tertullian inadvertently, perhaps, advances the same idea in *De Habitu Mulierum*, chap. iii., where he says: "A nobis *nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertinet ad nos; et legimus, Omnem scripturam* aedificationi habilem *divinitus inspirari.*" This construction of 2 Tim. iii. 16, as has been already shown, implies that some portions of Scripture do not tend to edification, and so are not inspired. Semler adopted this view, in his "Treatise on the Canon;" so did Kant. They maintained that the general utility of a book is the only criterion by which we can judge of its inspiration: an inspired book must be adapted to promote the moral improvement of all men in all ages; therefore only those parts of the Bible that have this tendency are thus inspired.[4] Theodore of Mopsuestia held different degrees

458

of inspiration, ascribing to Solomon not the gift of prophecy, but only that of wisdom, and judged of the Book of Job and the Canticles only from the human point of view. The Fifth Ecumenical Council censured him for this. (See Appendix *G* to "Lee on Inspiration.")

Chrysostom and Jerome, were generally orthodox on this subject, yet sometimes spoke unguardedly: thus Chrysostom admits of minor disagreements in the Evangelists, and says they prove the credibility of their writings, because if they all agreed in every thing, enemies would suspect collusion; and Jerome charges Paul with solecisms, hyperboles, and abrupt periods, which seem inconsistent with infallible divine inspiration, though he guards himself by saying that the divine power of the word itself destroys those apparent blemishes, or causes believers to overlook them. The scholastic divines generally held to the orthodox view of inspiration, though some of them fell into the error in question. Thus Hugo supposes that in

459

some instances the sacred writers drew from their own resources, *e. g.*, the author of Ecclesiastes. The mystics held to inspiration, but thought they shared it, though in a less degree, in common with the apostles. (See Hagenbach, i. 426, 427.) Indeed, some of the more fanatical set aside such portions of the Scripture as did not quadrate with their fantastic dreams. The Quakers are not altogether free

from this charge. Jacob Boehme, as might be supposed, expresses himself in the same way: “Though reason may say, give me only the letter of Scripture, yet the external letter does not impart sufficient knowledge, although it may guide us in our researches; the living letter also, which is the independent and revealed word and nature of God, must, through the medium of the revealed word, be laid open and read in the man who is taught and instructed by the Holy Ghost himself.” Language like that may be used by an orthodox divine; but when used by mystics it tends to infidelity. Thus Weigel affirms: “It is not enough to say. Here is such a writer, and he has the Holy Spirit, he cannot make a mistake. My dear friend, first of all prove the truth of thy statement; thou wilt find it a difficult work to prove and demonstrate it. Who is Cephas? who is Paul? says the apostle—who is this man or that? They are all men. It is God, God, God alone, who works by faith, and imparts judgment to try the spirits and discern the writings.”

That is as much as to say, the inspiration is in us who read the Scriptures, not in the apostles who wrote them. By our theopneustic infallibility we determine what of the writings of Peter and Paul are true and useful, and what are false and useless. Luther once applied this test, and by *his* infallible judgment ascertained that the Epistle of James is “an epistle of straw:” a worthless and wicked forgery, because he had not judgment enough to see how it harmonizes with the Epistle of Paul on the subject of justification! He lived long enough, however, to reverse his infallible judgment on this as well as on other points.

In order to put tradition on the same ground with Scripture, some Romanists, especially the Jesuits, deny that all Scripture is inspired. The universities of Louvain and Douay condemned (in 1588) the position of the Jesuits, that it is not necessary to suppose that all the words of Scripture are inspired by the Holy

Ghost. A celebrated Jesuit, Jean Adam, held that the sacred writers have sometimes made exaggerated statements; for this he was opposed by the Jansenists. Bellarmin, and Romish writers generally after him, held that the apostles were not primarily inspired to write, but to preach the gospel. He repudiated the testimony of Scripture in favor of inspiration, as a testimony in its own cause—as in the case of the Koran, which also claims inspiration. He says there is no sure criterion for the canonicity of the separate books in

Scripture itself.

It is well known that certain passages in 1 Cor. vii. are cited by many, as they were by Origen, to prove that Paul distinguished between what he says by inspiration and what he says without it: hence it is inferred that some parts of his Epistles (and so of other Scriptures) are inspired and some are not. It is thus stated by Webster and Wilkinson on 1 Cor. vii. 6:

> Τοῦτο, not merely the regulation just given, but all that he has just written (1–5), in answer to their letter. Κατὰ *συγγνώμην*, by permission—i. e., of the Holy Spirit. In the absence of any direct intimation of the divine will, he was conscious of no restraint or opposition to the exercise of his judgment and apostolical authority in this matter. Instances of such hinderance are given in Acts xvi. 6, 7, followed by proof that inspiration varied in degree, *ib.* 10. Some render "as giving permission, and not as giving command." But in sense and position, this passage is closely connected with 8, 10, 12, where the distinction is explicit between his personal and delegated authority. Observe also the use of ἐπιταγή in 25, and the antithesis to it in γνώμην *δίδωμι*, κ. τ. λ., similar to κατά *συγγν.* here. So 2 Cor. viii. 8, 10 with οὐ κατ' ἐπιτ. Compare οὐ κατὰ Κύριον, 2 Cor. xi. 17. The Apostle's carefulness to mark the limits of his direct inspiration on this and one or two other occasions unquestionably proves that where he does not thus qualify his statements, or injunctions, he is speaking with conscious infallibility in the name of the Lord, and under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit.

This is specious, but unsatisfactory; indeed it perverts the Apostle's meaning. In verse 6, Paul does mean to say, "I say this by allowance *for* you, not of command *to* you." So Robinson, "This I say by way of permission, and not of command—*i. e.*, not as an injunction which ye are bound to follow." Whedon: "It is a divinely allowable, but not commanded, suspension of the command in verses 3, 4." Bloomfield: "The Apostle means, in explanation of what he is saying on this subject, to apprise his readers that he is speaking of what is allowable or expedient, not what is enjoined to be done; *q. d.* (as Billroth explains), 'You will learn from what I have enjoined,

not what you *must* do, but what you *may* do.'" So Whitby, Alford, and others.

In verses 10, 11 he does not distinguish between his own uninspired words and what he elsewhere speaks by inspiration. But he distinguishes between the command given by Christ when upon

earth (Mark x. 12), and what he, as an inspired apostle, might give: not between different commands of his own, given at different times and under different conditions. Even Alford, who is latitudinarian on inspiration, is obliged to say on this passage:

Ordinarily, the apostle writes, commands, gives his advice, *under conscious inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God.* (See verse 40.) He claims expressly, chap. xiv. 37, that the things which he writes should be recognized as a command of the Lord. But here he is about to give them a command resting, not merely on *inspired apostolic authority*, great and undoubted as that was, but that of the Lord himself. So that all supposed distinction between "the Apostle's own writing of *himself* and *of the Lord*, is quite irrelevant. He *never* spoke *of himself*, being a vessel of the Holy Ghost, who ever spoke by him to the Church. The distinction between that which is imperative and that which is optional, that which is more and that which is less weighty in his writings, is to be made by the cautious and believing Christian, from a wise appreciation of the subject-matter, and of the circumstances under which it was written. ALL *is the outpouring of the Spirit*, but *not all for all time*, nor *all on the primary truths* of the faith."

On verse 40 he says:

This is modestly said, implying more than is expressed by it—not as if there were any uncertainty in his mind. It gives us the true meaning of the saying that he is giving his opinion, as verse 26—viz., not that he is speaking without inspiration, but that in the consciousness of inspiration he is giving that counsel which should determine the question.

In verses 12, 25, Paul does not say that he wrote according to his own uninspired judgment in that case. By the "commandment of the Lord," he does not mean an inspired communication, made by the Holy Spirit to the Apostle, but an express direction given by Christ when on the earth. He speaks now of cases which did not exist when Christ was upon the earth, and of which he had given no commandment as he had in regard to the case specified, verses 10, 11. It is really strange that any Biblical critic should have stumbled at the meaning of the Apostle in these three places. As has been well summed up:

In none of these cases does the Apostle disclaim inspiration. In the first case his meaning is that what he said was matter of permission, as to the person? whom he addressed, and not of command or positive injunction. In the second case he declares that he is reiterating a law once spoken by our Lord's own lips,

and is not uttering the inward suggestions of the Holy Ghost. In the third

case he declares that he is not reiterating such a law, but is giving utterance to these inward suggestions. Still in every case he speaks as an inspired apostle. In the former, the Spirit is fulfilling one part of our Lord's twofold promise, "He shall bring all things to your remembrance," etc. In the latter he is fulfilling the other part, "He shall teach you all things." "He will guide you into all truth."

The Holy Spirit has not left it to us to determine what is necessary and useful, and therefore inspired, and what is not. This would leave a very small Bible, indeed, to many persons. Nay, but all Scripture is inspired, and therefore we know that all is indispensable, all is "profitable."

§ 9. Mechanical Theory of Inspiration.

In the opposite extreme to the rationalistic theory of inspiration is the mechanical.

The mechanical theory virtually ignores the human element in inspiration, as the rationalistic virtually ignores the divine. It teaches that the Holy Spirit acted on men in a passive state. Those who were under the power of the inspiring Spirit were acted upon as mere machines, mechanically answering the force which moved them. They were rather the *pens* than the *penmen* of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Knapp says:

> The theory that the divine assistance which the sacred writers experienced extended to every thing which they wrote, words and letters not excepted, is doubtless one of the oldest in the Christian Church. In this view of the subject, the sacred writers were merely the *scribes* or *amanuenses* of the Holy Spirit; and were often compared by the ancients to flutes upon which the Spirit of God played. This comparison is found in the writings of Justin, Athenagoras, Macarius, and other Fathers; and also of the modern theologians, Musaeus, Baier, Quenstedt, and even of Schubert, in the middle of the eighteenth century. This theory accords very well in many respects with the mode of thought and conception which prevailed in the ancient world (*vide* Sec. 9); but it is very unlike the ideas which are entertained on the subject of inspiration at the present day. But it is still more important to remark respecting it, that the sacred writers themselves never profess to have enjoyed, while writing, inspiration of such a nature. And that they were not in reality the mere organs of the Divine Spirit, whatever may have been supposed by their contemporaries, must appear from a moment's observation.

He then alludes to the difference in style, the homely costume of some of the writers, the use which some of them made of the writings of others, their appeal to the evidence of their own senses, and other means of information, and their frequent mention of their private affairs, etc. He also speaks of the supposed distinction between their own advice and the express command

of God or of Christ (1 Cor. vii.), which has been otherwise explained. Wm. Lee thus describes this theory:

> It practically ignores the human element of the Bible, and fixes its exclusive attention upon the divine agency exerted in its composition. This system admits and can admit of no degrees. It puts forward one consistent and intelligible theory, without subdivisions or gradations. According to it each particular doctrine or fact contained in Scripture, whether in all respects naturally and necessarily unknown to the writers, or which, although it might have been ascertained by them in the ordinary course of things, they were not, in point of fact, acquainted with; or in fine, every thing, whether actually known to them, or which might become so, by means of personal experience or otherwise—each and every such point has not only been committed to writing under the infallible assistance and guidance of God, but is to be ascribed to the special and immediate suggestion, embreathment, and dictation of the Holy Ghost. Nor does this hold true merely with respect to the sense of Scripture and the facts and sentiments therein recorded, but each and every word, phrase, and expression, as well as the order and arrangement of such words, phrases, and expressions, has been separately supplied, breathed into (as it were), and dictated to the sacred writers, by the Spirit of God.

He, of course, repudiates this theory, receiving all that is good in it. Alluding to the distinction between revelation and inspiration, he says in a note referring to Coleridge's "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit:"

> He is throughout haunted by the belief that no other view of inspiration is conceivable than the mechanical theory in its baldest form. His remarks consequently tend to subvert the entire authority of the Bible. If the reader will bear in mind the distinction which I have drawn between revelation and inspiration, and will also substitute for the phrase "dictated by," in the following extract, the words "committed to writing under the guidance of," the objection which it expresses will appear absolutely pointless: "Yet one other instance, and let this be the crucial test of the doctrine. Say that the Book of Job was [dictated by] an infallible Intelligence. Then re-peruse the book; and still, as you proceed, try to apply the tenet; try if you can even attach any sense or semblance of meaning to

the speeches which you are reading. What! Were the hollow truisms, the unsufficing half truths, the false assumptions, and malignant insinuations of the supercilious bigots who corruptly defended the truth—were the impressive facts, the piercing outcries, the pathetic appeals, and the close and powerful reasoning with which the poor sufferer—smarting at once from his wounds, and from the oil of vitriol which the orthodox *liars for God* were dropping into them—impatiently, but uprightly and holily controverted this truth, while in will and in spirit he clung to it—were both [dictated by] an infallible Intelligence?" Let. iii.

The answer is: No; they were not "dictated by" an infallible Intelligence—the mechanical theory even does not go so far as that —but they were "committed to writing under the guidance of" an infallible Intelligence—so that the writer made no mistake

in recording the mistakes of Job and his friends, his wife, and the devil.

§ 10. The Dynamic Theory of Inspiration.

The dynamic theory of inspiration is the golden mean between the rationalistic, which virtually excludes the divine element, and is really no infallible, authoritative inspiration, and the mechanical, which virtually excludes the human element.

The term is derived from δύναμις, power. This word occurs in the New Testament some twenty times in the plural, and is variously rendered "wonderful works," "mighty works," "miracles," "workers of miracles;" and in six places "powers," as "powers of the heavens," etc. It is thus used for miracles, the efficacious influences which produce them, and the agents by which they are wrought. It is also used in the singular for "a miracle" (Mark viii. 39), and for the "virtue" by which it is wrought (Luke vi. 19; viii. 46). It is used of "the power of the Spirit," by which Jesus and the apostles made known the will of God infallibly, and ratified it by miracles. (Luke iv. 14; Rom. xv. 13, 19). So of the inspiration of prophets and apostles. (Luke i. 17; xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8; vi. 7; *Cf.* Acts ii. 4.)

The word dynamical is therefore not ill-chosen to set forth the character of divine inspiration. Some refer this dynamism to the human subject. Thus Fields:

> Dynamical inspiration is the phrase used to describe an influence

acting upon living *powers*, and manifesting itself through them according to their natural laws: man is not converted into a mere machine; but all his mental faculties and habits are used and directed by the Divine Spirit in the work of making known the will of God.

Others refer the *dynamism* to the Divine Agent. Thus McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia:

The orthodox, or generally accepted view, contents itself with considering Scripture to be inspired in such a sense as to make it infallibly certain, when apprehended in its legitimate sense, and of absolute authority in all matters of faith and conscience. This theory has lately been, with great propriety, described as the *dynamical*, purporting that the power or influence is from God, while the action is human.

There is no contradiction between these statements; indeed, the one is complemental of the other. The *dynamism* embraces both the divine and the human element. Rational beings have no innate, independent *dynamism* which can infallibly discover religious truth, and authoritatively declare it to the world either by

mouth or pen. Irrational beings (or rational beings in a purely passive state) cannot be the subjects and *media* of the divine dynamism; but, on the contrary, the *powers* of those who are inspired are never so active as when they are under this divine afflatus. Hence there are great differences, not only with regard to the subject-matter of divine inspiration, but also in respect to the manner and style of its communication to the world.

Orthodox writers have ventured to enumerate what they somewhat ambiguously denominate, "Degrees of Inspiration." In doing this they have sometimes veered too much to the right or to the left on this abstruse subject. The degrees of inspiration usually given are the four following, thus stated by Bishop Wilson in his "Evidences:"

By the inspiration of *suggestion*, is meant such communications of the Holy Spirit as suggested and dictated minutely every part of the truths delivered. The inspiration of *direction* is meant of such assistance as left the writers to describe the matter revealed in their own way, directing only the mind in the exercise of its powers. The inspiration of *elevation* added a greater strength and vigor to the efforts of the mind than the writers could otherwise have attained. The inspiration of *superintendency* was that watchful care which preserved generally from any thing being put down derogatory to the revelation with which it was connected.

Doddridge, Dick, and others omit the "inspiration of *direction*," reducing the number to three, referring to Maimonides. Dr. Henderson enumerates five degrees: a divine excitement, invigoration (or elevation), superintendence, guidance, and direct revelation.

Most theologians adopt the threefold division of Claude Frassen, a Franciscan divine of the seventeenth century, to-wit: *inspiratio antecedens*, *concomitans*, and *consequens*. This theory is thus stated by Knapp:

> The first and highest degree of inspiration is the *revelation* of things before unknown to the sacred writers. This is called by Frassen *inspiratio antecedens*; but commonly by other writers, *revelation*, who thus make a distinction between inspiration and revelation, and hold that revelation is indeed always attended by inspiration, but that inspiration is not, in every case, preceded by revelation. Every thing in the sacred Scriptures, they say, is inspired, but every thing there is not revealed; for much which is contained in the Bible was known to the sacred writers from their own reflection. The second degree of inspiration is the security against error which God affords the sacred writers in the exhibition of doctrines or facts with which they are already acquainted, the care which he takes in the selection, truth, and intelligibleness of the subjects introduced, and the words by which they are expressed, etc. This is called by Frassen, *inspiratio concomitans*. The third degree of inspiration is the divine authority stamped upon
>
> 466
>
> writings originally composed without inspiration, by the approval of inspired men, and is called *inspiratio consequens*. This degree of inspiration is predicated of the historical hooks of the Old Testament which were approved by Jesus and the apostles; and of the Gospels Mark and Luke, which were approved by Peter and Paul, and afterward by John. This theory is developed by Doddridge, and still more fully by Töllner; the latter of whom endeavors to show that the authority of the Holy Scriptures as the source of our knowledge in matters of faith is perfectly secured, even in cases where the lowest degree of inspiration is admitted.

The doctrine of degrees may be held in perfect conformity with the dynamical theory of inspiration; but there is some danger incurred in its development—as, *e. g.*, in regard to the Gospels of Mark and Luke; since there is no satisfactory proof that these evangelists did not write, with the apostles, under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, and so did not need, though they received, the indorsement of Peter and Paul, as they did of all the other apostles who survived their writings. The caveat of Mr. Lee

("Inspiration" p. 34) is here in place:

"The tendency of all such hypotheses—for even their authors allow that as hypotheses alone they can be regarded—is to fine down to the minutest point, if not altogether to deny, the agency of the Holy Spirit in certain portions of the Bible."

[In harmony with the foregoing distinctions, Dr. Pope well says:

Most orthodox Churches have more recently endeavored to maintain a doctrine of *plenary* inspiration in harmony with the notion of different *degrees*. Rejecting the terms *mechanical* and *verbal*, as both inconsistent with the human element, they have sometimes used *dynamical*, as indicating that the inspiring influence was not so much *upon* as *in* and *through* the writers: the result, however, being the infallible rule of faith delivered by the instrumentality of men acted upon according to the laws of their own nature. This has required the distinction of *suggestion*, the direct revelation of things otherwise unknown; *elevation*, providing for the due *preparation* of the instruments; and *superintendency*, as guarding the processes from the intrusion of error. . . . Those who reject all such theories of distinction are wont to attribute them to the influence of Maimonides: but unjustly, for they are held by some of the most eminent and orthodox writers on the subject in all Churches; and in some form must be accepted by every dispassionate student as nowhere contradicted by Scripture. This view of the co-ordination of the Divine and Human undoubtedly lies at the foundation of the true doctrine; but its dogmatic definition is difficult and as dangerous as difficult.[5]

Bishop Martensen thus describes the individuality of the apostles, and the complemental character of their labors and writings:

The Church, as such, could not have been founded save by particular men, in

whom the Holy Spirit who pervaded all attained the freest and most personal revelation. As the believing Peter, prompt to confess his Lord, stood at that moment before him as the representative of the apostles, the Saviour designates him "the rock" of the faith; and thus expresses the value and importance of what was personal and distinctive in the characters of his apostles, as furthering the establishment of his Church. It holds true concerning every age of the Church's history, that its development cannot progress, cannot surmount the agitation to which it is liable, unless its spirit be centralized in individuals, from whom an organizing energy may go forth to the many, springing from them as from personal and life-giving fountains: individuals in whose spiritual authority the Church finds its

attracting and uniting center, and who therefore may be designated pillars and buttresses of the Church. . . . What we thus find true in the case of subsequent and relative eras of the Church's development must prominently hold good concerning the original era of its development, concerning its first establishment. . . . There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are diverse forms of apostolic doctrine, but it is the one fundamental truth that actuates them all. It is by distributing his power in different forms and forces that the Spirit reveals his fullness and his stores of wealth. The perfect expression of the Spirit's revelation in the formation of the Church is not to be found in the phase of thought or teaching of any one apostle, but in the sum total of apostolic consciousness; and this again is the only perfect embodiment of the Church's consciousness regarding its fundamental relations to the Lord and to the Spirit, to the world and to itself. As the representatives of the Mother Church, the apostles not only express the consciousness of the Church at one particular time, they are the representatives of the Christian Church for all time.[6]

Here is valuable truth, cautiously expressed; though such statements must be carefully guarded, else they are easily perverted into insinuating and dangerous error.]

Dynamic inspiration comprehends the following six particulars:

1. *The conception of new truths.* The Paraclete was promised to the apostles to "teach them all things;" to "guide them into all the truth;" and to "show them things to come." (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13.) The Holy Spirit inspired the apostles with original ideas, such as had never before been made known to them, and such as they could not acquire by intuition or ratiocination.

2. *The memory of truths revealed.* The Paraclete was also promised to the apostles to "bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ had said unto them" (John xiv. 26) while he was with them on the earth, or, as in the case of Paul, after he had ascended to heaven. There was no *lapsus* of memory

when, under divine inspiration, they recorded the sayings of their Lord.

3. *The selection of documentary matter.* The Hebrews had an extended literature. It was impossible to put all of it into the sacred volume; and if it could have been done the work would have been an unmanageable conglomeration. But some of it was important to be duly authenticated and infallibly transmitted to "the ages to come," as essential to the development of the great scheme of providence and grace. Inspiration was needed and granted for this

delicate task. Hence the sacred penmen were infallibly directed in the selection of documents and their faithful transcription: such were genealogies, chronologies, biographies, speeches, proverbs, songs, riddles, fables, and translations. In many of these there may be numerical, doctrinal, literary, and other errors and imperfections; but these do not argue a lack of inspiration in those who selected and transcribed these documents. The writer of the Book of Job, for example, did not believe many of the statements made by Job, his friends, his wife, and Satan, nor did he, or the Holy Spirit who enabled him to commit them to writing, expect any one to confound them with God's own revealed truth. So of translations, as from the Hebrew to the Greek by the Seventy. Christ and his apostles knew very well that the Seventy sometimes incorrectly translated the Hebrew Scriptures; yet they quote from the Septuagint, as the version then in common use, just as a Biblical critic in our day quotes from the authorized version, though he is aware of its errors and defects. So with all the rest.

4. *Plenary knowledge.* Some object to the formula, "plenary inspiration," as if it necessarily involved the mechanical theory (which it does not), or as if it implied the possession of all knowledge (which is not the case). Thus McClintock and Strong, in their Cyclopedia, say: "Plenary inspiration is a phrase nowhere warranted by the Scriptures as predicated of themselves. Christ alone was plenarily inspired (John iii. 34) of all human beings. The term plenary *authority* would be far more scriptural and definite." This may be questioned. The objection mistakes the matter. Even the advocates of the mechanical theory never supposed that the apostles were inspired with the knowledge of all human science and philosophy. But our Lord did promise that the Holy Spirit should teach them *all things* pertinent,

and "bring *all things* to their remembrance whatsoever he himself had said unto them." (John xiv. 26.) He assures them, "When he, the Spirit of the truth [the article is in the Greek, showing that divinity, and not human science, is meant], is come, he shall guide you into all the truth [where the article is again in the Greek]; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." (John xvi. 13; *cf.* ver. 14, 15 with Matt. xi. 27.) So, when in the Great Commission our Lord told his disciples to teach the nations all things whatsoever he had commanded (Matt. xxviii.

20), he intended to qualify them for this work by giving them the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Thus endowed they shunned not to declare all the counsel of God, keeping back nothing that was profitable to those whom they instructed in the things of God (Acts xx. 20, 27), teaching every man in all wisdom—that is, revealed truth (1 Cor. ii. 7)—to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: the "working" of God, working in them mightily to this end (Col. i. 28, 29; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 15–17).

5. *Verbal expression.* Some object to the formula, "verbal inspiration," as if it also necessarily involved the mechanical theory; but it does not. It is idle to say, as McClintock and Strong do say, that words are incapable of inspiration; that we do not always think in words; that there are varieties, and even imperfections of style, in the sacred writings; and that the theory is useless and comparatively recent. There is great danger of going into mere logomachy on this subject. Thus Dr. Henderson, who opposes verbal inspiration, seems to understand that it implies the immediate communication to the writers of every word and syllable and letter of what they wrote, independently of their intelligent agency, and ignoring their peculiar mental faculties and habits. This is contrary to the dynamical theory, and even some who favor the mechanical theory, as Calamy and Gaussen, consider inspiration as consistent with the greatest diversity of mental endowments, culture, and taste of the writers, and with a perfect exercise of their intelligent agency; as consistent with the use of their own memory, reason, mode of thinking, and language; and as consistent too with making what they were to write the subject of diligent and laborious study, only insisting that it was all under the infallible direction of the Holy Spirit. Thus Garbett says:

It does not imply, then, (1) that a supernatural power made the words or communicated the knowledge of them for the first time to the writers. Nor does it involve (2) that the peculiar habits and familiar mode of language of the writer did not mold the sentences and the place of the individual words, perhaps their very form. Nor (3) does it exclude the possibility that the fact affirmed by the use of some particular word, as, for instance, that the sons of Esarhaddon found refuge in Armenia, might have been known to the writer, where such knowledge was possible, by the ordinary channels of human information. In short, it does not involve any denial that the man wrote it to whose authorship the particular book is imputed. Verbal inspiration admits all this, but goes on to assert that there was a

concurrence of the act of God with the act of man. 1. He endowed the man with those particular gifts, and chose him to be his instrument. 2. He guided his mind in the selection of what he should say, and of the revelation of his writing, where such revelation was made necessary through the defect of human knowledge. 3. He acted in and on the intellect and heart of the writer in the act of committing the words to writing, not only bestowing a more than human elevation, but securing the truthfulness of the thing written, and molding the language into the form accordant to his own will. To sum up the whole, verbal inspiration simply amounts to this—that while the words of Scripture are truly and characteristically the words of men, they are at the same time fully and concurrently the words of God.

Dr. Hannah states it concisely thus:

The inspired servants of God, while they retained the proper use of the powers and faculties with which the God of providence had endowed them, were always guided or assisted to use such language as would convey "the mind of the Spirit in its full and unimpaired integrity."

A large portion of the Scriptures consists of direct revelations from God, as in the case of the decalogue, "written by the finger of God," and the ceremonial law, which was dictated by God to Moses, and written down according to the letter. Then how often do these formulas occur: "Thus saith the Lord;" "The Spirit of God said;" "The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake;" "As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets;" "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias;" "The Scripture saith." So Christ promised his apostles: "Take no thought"—be not anxious—"how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak; for it is not ye that speak"—that is, of their own proper motion—"but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."

So Paul says: "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which

the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13.) Hence it is said "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." So a distinguished Wesleyan writer expresses it:

All Scripture is divinely inspired. Now, what is Scripture? Is it divine truth conceived in the mind? or divine truth written? Most assuredly, divine truth *written*. It is not, then, the conception of divine things in the minds of the sacred writers that constitutes the inspiration of which the

Bible speaks, but the writing down of divine things with the pen. *It is the writing that is inspired.* We have to do, not with the thought that existed in the minds of those who wrote the sacred pages, but with the expression or incarnation of that thought on paper. "A pure influx into the mind of an apostle is no sufficient guarantee for the instruction of the world, unless there be a pure efflux also; for, not the doctrine that has flowed in, but the doctrine that has flowed out, is truly all that we have to do with." With the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, we believe that, "had the force and effect of this observation been sufficiently pondered, the advocates of a mitigated inspiration would not have dissevered, as they have done, the inspiration of sentiment from the inspiration of language."

Thus there is one and the same *logos*: the *ratio*, or conception of truth inspired by the Holy Spirit into the mind of the speaker or writer; and the *oratio*, or expression of it by mouth or pen, under the direction of the same Spirit.

The divine *dynamism* and the human *dynamism* here coalesce; they are distinct, but not separate; the one is not to be confused with the other, nor absorbed by it. All Scripture is divine; all Scripture is human: none the less divine, because it is human: none the less human because it is divine. "Holy men of God spake"—there is the human dynamism—"as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"—there is the divine dynamism: and both concurring, the result is the inspired, infallible, and authoritative Scriptures.

6. *Miraculous verification.* This is to be viewed in a twofold light.

First, *ipso facto*. Inspiration verifies itself as miraculous. Inspiration is a miracle of omniscience. It is a supernatural communication of divine knowledge to prophets and apostles, who were conscious of the divine influence, and who knew the things that were freely given to them of God (1 Cor. ii. 12), even when they did not comprehend their full import (1 Pet. i. 10–12). The character of their communications, whether made orally or by writing, showed to all candid listeners or readers that they wrote and spoke by divine inspiration. Luke iv. 22; xxi. 15: "I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all

your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." *Cf.* Acts ii.; iv. 13; vi. 8—where Stephen is said to have been "full of faith and power, so that his enemies were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake." Here is the δύναμις, both of word and act. Hence the peculiar propriety of the phrase "dynamical

inspiration."

Second, concomitant. The power of working miracles may not have been granted to all the sacred writers: it may not have been necessary. But it was granted to all who had original divine revelations to make to the world, and to commit to writing as the permanent and infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice. So of prophecy, which is indeed a miracle of omniscience. The sacred writers, many of them, predicted future events, and they did this in confirmation of their doctrine: and it has had that effect. For while the utterance of predictions could not at the time enforce the truth of their teaching, like the miracles of healing and raising the dead, yet, being recorded, they are of equal value—not to say superior importance—to following ages. But these, with the work and witness of the Spirit, as authentications of the truth of the Scriptures, demand a separate consideration.

III. Demonstrations of Authenticity.

There are overwhelming demonstrations of the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, complemental of the strong presumptions and pregnant proofs already noticed.

§ 1. Miracles: Definition and Scriptural Idea.

Miracles constitute the first of these demonstrations.

A miracle is an event produced by the special interposition of the power of God, in sensible contravention of the established laws of nature, for the confirmation of some truth or the divine legation of some person. It is thus a prodigy of omnipotence exhibited for a special purpose worthy of divine interposition.

This corresponds with the terms usually employed in the Scriptures in speaking of miracles. There are three of these terms—occasionally used together, as in Acts ii. 22; Heb. ii. 4.

The first term, τέρας, occurs sixteen times in the New Testament: always in the plural, rendered "wonders," and always with σημεῖον. The second term, δύναμις, is of frequent occurrence, generally in the plural, when used in reference to this subject,

and is variously rendered, “wonderful work,” Matt. vii. 22; “mighty works,” Matt. xi. 20, *et al.*; “miracles,” Acts ii. 22, *et al.* The third term is σημεῖον, which occurs seventy-seven times in the New Testament, nearly always in reference to this meaning, and is variously rendered “sign” (which is its proper sense), Matt. xi. 38, *et al.*; “miracle,” John ii. 11, and twelve other times in John, four times translated “sign.” John uses no other word but σημεῖον for miracle, except once, τέρας, in the plural, rendered “wonders,” John iv. 48. The term σημεῖον is rendered “wonder” in Rev. xii. 1, 3; xiii. 13; and “token,” 2 Thess. iii. 17, where it refers to another matter.

By combining these three terms we have a good idea of a miracle: It is a *wonder*, or a prodigy designed to arrest attention; *power*, or a mighty work produced by supernatural energy; and a *sign*, or demonstration of the truth to be confirmed or the commission to be sealed. This is illustrated in Acts ii. 22, where all these terms are combined: “Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.” Here are prodigies or sensible contraventions of the established laws of nature, which those who witnessed them knew could be wrought by God alone, and which were wrought by him to seal the divine legation of Jesus of Nazareth. (*Cf.* John vi. 27; iii. 2; iv. 48; xx. 30, 31.)

The argument from miracles is simple and satisfactory: God alone can perform a miracle; he will not perform a miracle to support imposture; but he has wrought miracles to support the claims of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles; therefore their legation is divine and all their official teaching is true.

§ 2. Peculiarities of the Miracles of Scripture.

The miracles of Scripture are characterized by several peculiarities:

1. Their *multiplicity*. Hundreds of them are put on record, and vast numbers are unrecorded. (John xi. 47; xx. 30, 31; Acts x. 38; and *passim*.)

2. Their *variety*. They were not the repetition of certain wonders, as those of thaumaturgical jugglers, who acquire great

dexterity in their performance, and *seem* to accomplish them by

preternatural agency. But the Scripture miracles are of almost every conceivable kind; wonders in the heavens above, on the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth; on rational, irrational, and inanimate subjects; on the living to strike them dead, and on the dead to restore them to life.

3. Their *publicity*. These things were not done in a corner. Friends and foes alike witnessed them. The miracle of crossing the Red Sea was witnessed by Egyptians, many of whom were drowned, as well as by the Israelites who crossed over through the depths of the sea dry shod. Of like publicity were the stupendous miracles in the wilderness, crossing the Jordan, settling in Canaan, which were wrought before millions, public monuments being constructed as memorials of the well-known facts. So of the miracles of the prophets, of Christ and the apostles: they were occurrences of the greatest notoriety. (Acts ii. 22; iv. 16; Rom. xv. 18, 19.)

4. Their *moral intent*. Miracles were not wrought on their own account, nor for the aggrandizement of the human agent by whom they were effected, nor indeed primarily for the benefit of their subjects. Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles shunned all such display of miraculous power as would fasten upon them the reputation of mere wonder-workers: the reputation which Simon Magus sought, and which Simon Peter denounced as shocking in the extreme. Moses was instructed to perform miracles before Pharaoh and the children of Israel, to confirm his divine legation as a deliverer and a lawgiver. Elijah wrought miracles for the avowed purpose of establishing his claims as a restorer of the law. Jesus wrought miracles to prove that he was the Messiah, and to confirm the truth of his doctrine. The apostles avowed this as the intent of their miracles.

5. Their *normal result*. We do not say their uniform result, as the prejudiced Pharisees attributed the miracles of Jesus to the power of Beelzebub! But their normal result was realized. Miracles did produce conviction, not only of their own preternatural character, but also of the divine legation of those by whom they were wrought. Their beneficent or maleficent character was symbolically suggestive. All the miracles of Jesus, with scarcely an exception, were miracles of beneficence: “The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers

are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. xi. 5); demoniacs are relieved, famishing multitudes are fed, raging winds and waves are calmed, and all nature is made subservient to the Son of man. How all this suggests and symbolizes the grand spiritual design of his mission! (*Cf.* Isa. xxxv.) Without miracles neither the law nor the gospel could have been authenticated; by them they were authenticated, confirmed, and established, despite all the opposition of earth and hell. The divine power by which they were wrought was patent and obvious to all, except the obstinate and contumacious; and even they were obliged to confess that there had been "a prophet among them," and "that great and notable miracles had been wrought by him." The sanction which they gave to the oracles delivered was obvious to all who credited their divine character. Nicodemus tersely expresses the common sentiment of mankind: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." (John iii. 2.) For this reason Jesus pointed the disciples of John to the miracles which he wrought for the attestation of his Messiahship. (Matt. xi. 1–6.) They saw in those miracles of mercy a demonstration of the divine character and benevolent intent of his mission, and they were convinced and satisfied that he was the Christ.

The miracles of judgment and severity wrought for the punishment of the enemies of the Israelites—*e. g.*, the Egyptians, Canaanites, Chaldeans, Assyrians, and others—and for the punishment of the Israelites themselves when they proved disloyal to their theocracy, all had a similar intent, and produced their normal result. They were adapted to the character and condition of the people among whom and for whose benefit they were wrought. This will account for the apparently trivial miracles which were wrought by Elisha, as "healing the waters" of Jericho, making an iron ax-head swim, removing poison from the pottage, and the like. The people of the ten tribes were at that time so degraded in mind and manners that it required such prodigies to arrest their attention, and induce them to pay regard to the teachings of the prophet. For that reason too there were miraculous inflictions of judgment upon those who opposed them: as in the case of the fire that came down from heaven at

the bidding of Elijah to consume those who were sent to apprehend him; and the bears that came out of the wood and destroyed forty-two young scoffers at Elisha, at his imprecation. They were not "children," as the word is rendered, but young men, the profane wits of the age, who wanted Elisha, whom they ridiculed as "bald head," with an emphasis of repetition, to "go up" to heaven, as Elijah his master had just gone up. These prophets were sent to turn the hearts of the people back again to Jehovah, whom they had forsaken for Baal; and this was the way they were treated—persecuted by rulers, lampooned by jesters, disregarded by the great mass of the people: no wonder is it that Ahab and Jezebel, their prophets and priests, the scoffers at Bethel, and other opposers of the theocratic reformation which the prophets were sent to effect, were visited with miraculous judgments. For a similar reason, when Ananias and Sapphira were about to ruin the infant Church by their fraud and hypocrisy, they were struck dead by miracle, at the word of the apostle, whose authority was thereby attested, "and great fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these things, and believers were the more added to the Lord, both of men and women" (Acts v.); and the normal result of this miracle is realized to this day. So of the judgment which at the word of Paul came upon Elymas the sorcerer, when he would not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord, but sought to turn away the deputy of Paphos from the faith, which he was disposed to accept. (Acts xiii.) The miracles of judgment, wrought at the word of apostles and prophets, not only served to confirm their authority, but also to show that while divine revelation is beneficial in its intent—as symbolized by the miracles of mercy which were wrought with so much profusion and evident pleasure to the instrument as well as the subject—yet it has its sanctions, which may not be lightly disregarded. They who build on "this stone" are safe and sure amid all storms and tempests: "whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder." (Matt. xxi. 44; *cf.* Isa. viii. 14, 15.) "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost according

to his own will." (Heb. ii. 3, 4.) This was according to the promise of Christ to his apostles at the time of his ascension, as recorded in Mark xvi. 15–20.

6. *Historic value.* The miracles of both the Old and New Testaments were recorded by those who wrought them or saw them wrought. Moses recorded the miracles wrought by him. Surely he knew whether he led the Israelites through the Red Sea and through the wilderness; whether the prodigies of Sinai took place; whether the host of Israel was miraculously supported by manna from the clouds and water from the rock. He was *quorum pars*. He was himself a living miracle, as well as an agent for the performance of miracles, and the writer of the history of which they constitute so great a part. Did not Matthew and John, whose histories we trace back to the apostolic age, know whether Jesus performed the thousands of miracles which they witnessed and in part recorded? Did not Paul know whether he received personal revelations from Jesus? whether he possessed and exercised the miraculous powers, by which he says "Christ wrought by him to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God?" (Rom. xv. 18, 19.) Did he not know whether the Corinthians to whom he wrote, in so familiar a manner, about their miraculous endowments, really possessed them? and would he have been so insane as to give them directions concerning their exercise and the design of their manifestation, if it were all a fabrication or a myth? (1 Cor. xii.–xiv.) We have seen that friends and foes alike recognize the truth of the record. The Pentateuch contains the early history and civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the Hebrew nation. The Gospels and Epistles contain the early history and principles of Christianity. All admit that what is contained in these works, as we have them, was contained in them at the time they were first published to the world. Indeed, before the Gospels were published every thing which they contain was proclaimed in all parts of the world. Christianity, as a concrete system, crystallized around the facts thus proclaimed. Now, miracles constitute a great part of the system of which they are the confirmatory seal. As they cannot be consistently denied, the oracles which they confirm cannot be consistently rejected. It is not arguing in a vicious circle to say that the history proves the

miracles and the miracles prove the history. The proof in the latter

case is not of the history as a literary work which was written, say, by Matthew, John, or Paul—no one ever adduced miracles for this purpose—but miracles do prove the divine character of the revelation therein contained, while the history shows that the miracles were performed. Lapse of time somewhat affects the testimony concerning them, but does not in the least affect their objective importance. Bishop Butler says:

> It is an acknowledged historical fact that Christianity offered itself to the world, and demanded to be received, upon the allegation, this is, as unbelievers would speak, upon the pretense of miracles, publicly wrought to attest the truth of it in such an age; and that it was actually received by great numbers in that very age, and upon the professed belief of the reality of these miracles. And Christianity, including the dispensation of the Old Testament, seems distinguished by this from all other religions.
>
> The fact itself is allowed, that Christianity obtained, that is, was professed to be received, in the world, upon the belief of miracles, immediately in the age in which it is said those miracles were wrought; or that this is what its first converts would have alleged as the reason for their embracing it. Now certainly it is not to be supposed that such numbers of men, in the most distant parts of the world, should forsake the religion of their country, in which they had been educated; separate themselves from their friends, particularly in their festival shows and solemnities, to which the common people are so greatly addicted, and which were of a nature to engage them much more than any thing of that sort among us; and embrace a religion which could not but expose them to many inconveniences, and indeed must have been a giving up the world in a great degree, even from the very first, and before the empire engaged in form against them—it cannot be supposed that such numbers should make so great, and, to say the least, so inconvenient a change in their whole institution of life, unless they were really convinced of the truth of those miracles upon the knowledge or belief of which they professed to make it. And it will, I suppose, be readily acknowledged that the generality of the first converts to Christianity must have believed them; that as, by becoming Christians they declared to the world they were satisfied of the truth of those miracles, so this declaration was to be credited. And this their testimony is the same kind of evidence for those miracles as if they had put it in writing, and these writings had come down to us. And it is real evidence, because it is of facts which they had capacity and full opportunity to inform themselves of. It is also distinct from the direct or express historical evidence, though it is of the same kind; and it would be allowed to be distinct in all cases. For were a fact expressly related by one or more ancient historians, and disputed in after ages, that this fact is acknowledged to have been believed by great numbers of the age in which

the historian says it was done, would be allowed as additional proof of such fact, quite distinct from the express testimony of the historian.

It would be an interesting literary feat to begin at Genesis and end with Revelation, eliminating all references to miracles

in the sacred volume: one would like to see what sort of a fabric would be left, for the miracles of Scripture enter into the very warp and woof of the wondrous web.

§ 3. Objections to Miracles Considered.

There are of course objections to miracles. But as we have proved their actual occurrence, their supernatural character, and their vast importance, it is vain for any to attempt to show that they are not possible, or not supernatural, or not important.

1. It might be expected that we should take some notice of Mr. Hume's argument to show that miracles are not possible. He says: "It is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true; but not contrary to experience that testimony should be false. No testimony, therefore, can even render a miracle probable." If a miracle cannot be credibly reported, then it cannot be wrought. And so the followers of Mr. Hume, especially the skeptical scientists of our age, contend that whether there be a God or not, the laws of nature are so fixed that they cannot be changed. No testimony therefor can establish the fact of a miracle. Now, if there be no God, of course there can be no miracle—and that ends the matter. But if there is a God—the creator and upholder of all things—it is puerile to say that he cannot control what are called the laws of nature. These are not forces nor agents; they are simply the established principles by which God has chosen to govern the universe. Were there no such established principles, well known and recognized, there could be no miracle—for a miracle is a controlment of those laws by the Law-maker himself—and surely he is not under the dominion of those laws, so that he cannot control them for special ends. As to Hume's sophism, that has been so often exposed that we are ashamed to give it any attention. He says that he conceived it in a Jesuit institution on the continent, and used it for a Jesuitical purpose. He was a man of "infinite jest"—nothing of the sort came amiss to him. He knew well enough that the word *experience* is

ambiguous. If it refers to all mankind in every age, then he perpetrates a *petitio principii*—he assumes the question in debate—and he is to be met by a simple, flat contradiction: miracles are not contrary to the experience of all men in every age, as from the time of Moses to Malachi, and from the birth of Jesus to the death of the Apostle John,

miracles were performed in thousands of instances, and were witnessed and attested by millions of men. If he means his own personal experience, then that is not pertinent to the case in hand. If these prodigies were of daily occurrence—witnessed by every man, in every age—they would cease to be miraculous. If Mr. Hume had been present, with all his faculties about him, when the miracles recorded in the gospel are said to have taken place, and he had the evidence of his senses that no such feats were accomplished—we mean such as obviously required divine interposition, as, *e. g.*, raising the dead—then indeed no testimony could convince him that the miracles were wrought. But what has that to do with the question? No one ever dreamed that Mr. Hume was present on such an occasion. What then has his negative experience to do with a question that has been long since settled by the positive testimony of thousands of competent spectators? It is absurd to attempt to rank the feats attributed to Apollonius, Vespasian, and other heathens, the marvels reported by credulous Fathers, the pious frauds of papists and others, with the miracles of the gospel. It is not denied that by a well-known power of the imagination diseases of a certain kind have been suddenly removed. Physiologists and pathologists understand this. But when did philosopher or priest, dead or alive, ever raise a dead man to life? Can a corpse put forth faith in an impostor, and by the power of imagination, thus excited, return to life? A man must have something more than a powerful imagination to feed five thousand men besides women and children with five barley loaves and two small fishes, and have twelve baskets full of fragments after the meal. But the writers of the New Testament solemnly affirm that they witnessed hundreds of miracles of this sort, and performed many of them themselves; and is not their positive "testimony" worth more than Mr. Hume's negative "experience?" Arnobius, who lived near those times, asks with great pertinency, "Shall we say that the men of those times were inconsiderate, deceitful, and brutish enough to feign having seen

what they never saw? and that when they might have lived in peace and comfort they chose gratuitous hatred and obloquy?" We can see how prejudice, love of the world, fear of persecution, and the like, might deter men from embracing the gospel, though thus miraculously attested; but it is impossible to account for

481

its reception by others, if the miracles—of which the gospel itself was one—were not wrought, as recorded in the sacred writings.

2. Rationalists who have been forced to admit the genuineness of at least some of the Gospels and Epistles have tried to show that the miracles which they record are not of a supernatural character. Thus Professor Paulus explains the miracle of the tribute-money, by Peter's catching a fish, opening its mouth to take out the hook, and then selling it for a *stater*. Christ's walking on the sea was his walking on the sea-shore. Peter's walking on the water was swimming. The feeding of the five thousand was the supply of food by a hospitable caravan just passing, and the apostles were employed in conveying it in baskets. But such ridiculous and blasphemous "handling of the word of God" has had its day. Suppose it possible to account on natural principles for some of the miracles of the New Testament, what has that to do with the matter? Admit the record, and you have hundreds of miracles, well attested, which no natural causes can produce, and no jugglery can simulate. But the great miracle of the resurrection of Christ is sufficient to set aside all rationalistic speculations on this subject. Nature does not raise dead people to life. Nor does the mythological theory help the matter at all. As we have seen in the argument concerning the resurrection of Christ, it takes time for a myth to crystallize; but the resurrection of Christ was attested and proclaimed the very day it occurred. The testimony to its real occurrence is the same that we have to-day: it has not been altered one jot or one tittle. There it is, just as the first witnesses set it forth, and to attempt to explain the miracle on natural principles is not less impious than to deny it, while it is ten times as absurd. But this question has been already discussed. We are sorry to say that there is still a leaning toward the rationalistic notion of miracles among some reputedly orthodox divines. Leibnitz and Wolf and others held to the notion of "preformation"—that is, that "God has, *a priori*, included miracles in the course of nature." Well, suppose, according to any scheme of predestination, Calvinistic or Arminian,

God has fore-ordained miracles, does that take away from them their supernatural character? Cannot supernatural events be preordained as well as natural? Predestination has nothing whatever to do with the question.

The authors of “The Unseen Universe,” who repudiate the

orthodox view of miracles as inconsistent with their principle of “continuity,” and who assert, “It cannot for a moment be said that Christ was above law; he speaks of himself and is spoken of by the apostles as bound in all respects by the laws of the universe,” are not satisfied with this solution. They say:

> Charles Babbage, the designer of the well-known calculating engine, showed in a very remarkable book which he called a ninth Bridgewater treatise, that it would be possible to design and construct a machine which, after having worked for a long time according to a particular method of procedure, should suddenly manifest a single breach in its method and then resume and forever afterward keep to its original law. He argued from this that an apparent breach in the physical procedure of the universe is quite consistent with the fundamental idea of law. Jevons also, commenting upon these speculations of Babbage, remarks thus in his “Principles of Science” (Vol. II., p. 438), “If such occurrences can be designed and forseen by a human artist, it is surely within the capacity of the Divine Artist to provide for similar changes of law in the mechanism of the atom, or the construction of the heavens.”

Messrs. Tait and Stewart, the reputed authors of “The Unseen Universe,” prefer this solution to that of orthodox divines; but do not think it fully meets the case. They say Christ is an infinitely powerful Being, yet at the same time subject to the laws of the universe: none of his work, therefore, can infringe the great law of continuity.

> We can very easily dispose of any scientific difficulty regarding miracles. For if the invisible was able to produce the present visible universe with all its energy, it could of course, *a fortiori*, very easily produce such transmutation of energy from the one universe into the other as would account for the events which took place in Judea. Those events therefore are no longer to be regarded as absolute breaks of continuity, a thing which we have agreed to consider impossible, but only as the result of a peculiar action of the invisible upon the visible universe. When we dig up an ant-hill, we perform an operation which to the inhabitants of the hill is mysteriously perplexing, from transcending their experience, but we know very well that the whole affair happens without any breach of

continuity of the laws of the universe. In like manner, the scientific difficulty with regard to miracles will, we think, entirely disappear, if our view of the invisible universe be accepted, or indeed if any view be accepted that implies the presence in it of living beings much more powerful than ourselves.

All this simply means that Christ, who wrought the miracles, was subject to the infrangible law of continuity, and therefore there was no "interference of the Divine Governor with his usual physical procedure."

There is a more plausible theory, generally fathered upon Olshausen, but favored by Trench, and others who have been tinctured

by German semi-rationalism, that miracles are nothing but a quickening of the processes of nature. It was the normal working of the divinity in Jesus, for example, to develop nature. He did not reverse any of its processes, but only accelerated them. That was indeed a marvelous acceleration of the processes of nature when our Lord suffered the demons to go into the two thousand swine and make them run violently down a steep place into the sea, so that they died—a natural death! That was a wonderful acceleration of the processes of nature, when, without the twig of a grape-vine—without even a dried grape with which some fanatics make what they call "unfermented wine"—in a moment "the conscious water saw its God, and blushed." Here was a large supply of the best wine, as generous as if it had passed through all the processes from the planting of the vine, and the development of its juices in the purple grape, to the fermentation of the liquor; and yet there was no process about it—whether of fermentation, or treading, or growth, or planting—it was the work of a moment, and contrary to all the known processes of nature, and no acceleration of them. Is it a process of nature which may be accelerated by clay and spittle, by a touch, by a word, to give sight to men born blind, to cure men incurably deaf, lame, leprous, wounded (as in the case of Malchus, whose ear was cut off, but restored in a moment by the great Healer), or chronically diseased beyond all relief from physicians? To raise to life men actually dead and buried, is this an acceleration of the processes of nature? Is it not rather a reversal of all those processes? Does not a miracle, in its very essence and design, imply that there is an agency at work above all natural processes? that

One greater than nature is at work? even the Lord of nature, to whom, indeed, a miracle is just as easy as any natural act, and no more a result of divine operation than the latter, but sensibly distinguished from it by the time and mode and intent of its performance. Dr. Knapp well says:

> The attempt to explain by natural principles events expressly said in Scripture to be miraculous, performed for the attainment of important moral ends not otherwise attainable, is inconsistent with the authority of the Bible, and is a direct impeachment of its truth, and goes to prove that the sacred writers, or those who performed the pretended miracles, were either impostors, or themselves deluded fanatics.

3. It has become rather fashionable to underrate the importance

of miracles. They may, indeed, have been performed; their supernatural character may be admitted; but they are of no great consequence. They may have served to waken the attention of a stupid people to moral subjects; but we have little use for them. Indeed, the doctrines of the gospel serve rather to authenticate the miracles than *vice versa*. Hence some writers on the Evidences of Christianity lay all the stress upon the obviously divine character of the doctrines and morals inculcated in the Bible, and no stress at all, or very little, upon the miracles. According to this view, it is a pity that any record was made of the miracles; and so, indeed, some of them seem to think, as they evade the topic as much as possible. They seem to wish skeptics to believe the gospel notwithstanding the incredible accounts of miracles which they comprise! Never mind the miracles, they say, there is the gospel: it is self-evidencing in its transcendent and divine excellence. If you doubt the miracles, do not doubt the doctrine. That is the plain English of the matter.

This is the ground taken by the Rev. Stanley T. Gibson, in his recent work, “Religion and Science.” After arguing that many of the gospel miracles fail to fulfill the conditions specified by Paley and others, and that many pretended miracles do fulfill the conditions, he says, “My conclusion is that the argument from the miracles cannot in these days be relied upon as the foundation for Christian belief.” He condescends, indeed, to say:

> It is not miracles, not even in the strictest sense of the word, which I call in question, but the evidential argument founded upon them. That argument has not lost all its value, but it has lost some. It may claim a

place, but not the first place in Christian evidences. It is auxiliary rather than fundamental, fitted as matters stand rather to confirm the believer than to convince the skeptic.

Fine teaching is this by a beneficed clergyman of the Established Church of England! And the Rev. Dr. Abbott goes farther than that in his sermons in the University of Oxford—even denying the resurrection of the body of Jesus, utterly impugning the importance of miracles, and rejecting the supernatural element in the gospels.

Now we earnestly protest against all such deceitful handling of the word of God. The doctrine, indeed, is of more intrinsic importance than the miracle: just as the end is more important

than the means. Strength is more important than food; but is food, by which alone I gain strength, of but little importance? Health is of more importance than physic, but must I therefore throw physic to the dogs and die as I deserve for my folly? The importance of miracles is seen in connection with the importance of the doctrines which they authenticate. It is a good rule not to introduce a god unless the occasion warrants it, and this has divine indorsement. If God appears in supernatural operations to attest the truth of any professed revelation, we may be sure it is of the utmost importance; but if the revelation is so important can the miracles which authenticate it be of no importance? We do not hesitate to say that if miracles are ignored, the doctrines which they were wrought to attest will share the same fate!

Dr. Paley concludes his admirable argument on this subject with this terse paragraph:

> In viewing the detail of miracles recorded in these books we find every supposition negatived by which they can be resolved into fraud or delusion. They were not secret, nor momentary, nor tentative, nor ambiguous, nor performed under the sanction of authority, with the spectators on their side, or in affirmance of tenets and practices already established. We find also the evidence alleged for them, and which evidence was by great numbers received, different from that upon which other miraculous accounts rest. It was contemporary, it was published upon the spot, it continued, it involved interests and questions of the greatest magnitude; it contradicted the most fixed persuasions and prejudices of the persons to whom it was addressed; it required from those who accepted it, not a simple, indolent assent, but a change, from thenceforward, of principles and conduct, a submission to consequences the most serious and the most

deterring, to loss and danger, to insults, outrage, and persecution. How such a story should be false, or, if false, how under such circumstances it should make its way, I think impossible to be explained; yet such the Christian story was. Such were the circumstances under which it came forth, and in opposition to such difficulties did it prevail.

Dr. Knapp pertinently says:

The doctrine of Christ and the apostles is only so far established as they appeal to miracles. For they gave themselves out as *extraordinary and immediate ambassadors of God.* But this claim could not be proved merely by the internal excellence of the doctrines which they taught, and they could expect to be credited only when their extraordinary claims were supported by extraordinary facts. And it is on account of this intimate connection between the truth of their miracles and their character as extraordinary teachers that many who are unwilling to concede the latter are disposed to dispute the former. If the proof from miracles be once allowed, it follows directly that those who performed them were extraordinary and immediate messengers from God.

§ 4. Prophecy Defined.

486

The second of the overwhelming demonstrations of the authenticity of the Scriptures is prophecy.

By prophecy we mean a certain foretelling of events obviously contingent. It is thus a prodigy of omniscience, as a miracle is a prodigy of omnipotence; though of course all the divine perfections are involved in both.

Prophecy therefore is not a shrewd guess; as many knowing people foretold that the Germans would conquer the French in the late war [of 1870] because they were made of sterner stuff, were better organized, had greater resources, etc. It required no omniscient inspiration to make that guess, or indeed that the Russians would conquer the Turks in their war. Prophecy is not a conclusion drawn from the law of probabilities. That requires only a careful study of men, and history, and surrounding circumstances, and after all is but a problematical deduction: there is no certitude in it. Omniscience is not required for that. Prophecy is not the result of a mathematical calculation, like that of an eclipse, or the rising of Sirius, or the return of a comet, or the ebbing and flowing of the tides. Mathematics will foretell all these things without any special

aid from Omniscience. These are mathematical, not moral, necessary, not contingent, events. Prophecy is not, as Mr, Frothingham says, a conclusion drawn from an exaltation of the spirit when intensely fixed upon any subject. The character of Scripture prophecies differentiates them from all guesses, probable inferences, mathematical calculations, as well as from all frantic vaticinations and Delphic and Sibylline oracles.

The argument from prophecy, like that from miracles, is simple and satisfactory. God alone knows future contingent events; he will not communicate the knowledge of them, so that they might be foretold to support imposture; but he has communicated that foreknowledge to Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, who have announced the same in prophecy; therefore their legation is divine, and all their official teaching is true.

§ 5. Characteristics of Scripture Prophecies.

The prophecies of Scripture, like the miracles, are characterized by the following particulars:

1. Their *multiplicity*. There are hundreds of them on record.

"Four Prophets the Greater and Twelve Prophets the Lesser," and the Book of Revelation, are, as their titles indicate, full of predictions. Then there are numerous prophecies in the historical, poetical, and epistolary scriptures. Many of the Psalms, for example, are styled Prophetical Psalms, by eminence.

2. Their *variety*. They are not the repetition of a few oracular announcements, which by chance might be verified; but they have reference to all kinds of persons and things, such as diversify the infinitely checkered history of our world which records their fulfillment. Here are predictions referring to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Twelve Patriarchs; to Ishmael, Samson, Saul, David, Solomon, Josiah, Zedekiah, Hananiah, Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Cyrus, Alexander, and Antiochus; to John the Baptist, Judas Iscariot, Peter and John, Paul and Timothy, and many others. Here are predictions referring to all the great empires and states of the world: to Egypt and Ethiopia, Tyre and Sidon, Moab and Ammon, Amalek and Philistia, Idumea and Arabia, Midian and Syria, Assyria and Babylon, Media and Persia, Magog and Meshech, Greece and

Rome. Then there are predictions which refer particularly to the Jews, and especially to the destruction of Jerusalem, which were uttered and recorded about forty years before the events predicted took place, and the record of their fulfillment is given by one who was *quorum pars*, and who would have gladly falsified them, if he could have done so—Josephus the Jew. Then there are those which refer to Christ and the Paraclete and the Church. They are chiefly recorded in the Old Testament, which was extant before the advent of Christ, and the fulfillment of these is recorded in the New Testament, and in subsequent histories, reaching to the present day. These, indeed, are the principal prophecies of the Bible: hence the stress laid upon them by Christ and the apostles. Thus the stereotyped formula in the gospels, "That it might be fulfilled which was written by the prophet." Hence Christ says, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." (Luke xxiv. 44) Thus Peter: "To him give all the prophets witness." (Acts x. 43.) "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of, the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them

did signify, when it testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." (1 Pet. i. 10, 11.) Indeed, "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." (Rev. xix. 10.) What wonderful predictions have we in the Apocalypse concerning the downfall of the persecuting powers that afflicted the Church—first the Jews (Rev. iv.–xi.), then Pagan Rome (Rev. xii.–xix.), and finally all others after the millennium (Rev. xx. xxi.)!

3. Their *publicity*. As the miracles were not done in a corner, so the prophecies were not uttered in the dark recesses of a temple or cave. They were proclaimed to listening thousands in the great congregations assembled for worship, in the marts of business, to marshalled hosts, everywhere and on all occasions when expedient. They were recorded at the time, or shortly after, they were uttered, so that those who heard them had the opportunity of reading them. Thus the whole world knew that they were not smuggled in *post eventum*, as Porphyry alleged in regard to the prophecies of Daniel. It may be safely said that no writings in early times had as much notoriety as the prophecies of Scripture. Histories of equal notoriety

will show whether or not they have been fulfilled.

4. Their *moral intent*. As miracles were not wrought on their own account, nor for the aggrandizement of the human agent by whom they were effected, nor indeed primarily for the benefit of their subjects, so was it with regard to the prophecies. Thus Peter, speaking of the ancient prophets, says, "Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. i. 12.) And again, "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation [of self-solution]. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i. 20, 21.) The prophets had no personal interest in their own predictions; they gained nothing by prophesying except sometimes buffeting and imprisonment, bonds and death; very generally they were discredited as fanatics or impostors. Their prophecies were designed to arouse attention, and excite expectation, and prepare for the coming events which were thus casting their shadows before. As they were frequently

accompanied with miracles, they, even at the time of their utterance, served as credentials of the prophets, and when fulfilled, of course, demonstrated the divinity of their legation.

5. Their *normal result*. Though many at the time disregarded the predictions, yet others did take warning by them, and so realized their moral intent. They sustained the faith and hope of the Church from the time when it was said to the serpentine deceiver, "The woman's seed shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. iii. 15), to the time of the greatest of the prophets, who said, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii. 2). So from that period to the close of the canon, and down to us upon whom the ends of the world have come. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." (Rom. xv. 4.) How beautifully was this normal result developed when our Lord was upon the earth, and when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven! Jesus said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." He spake of the temple of his body; and John adds: "When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples

remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said." (John ii. 18, 22.) Thus the mission of the prophets worked out its normal results, either to produce faith in the candid, to confirm the believer, or to confound and condemn the gainsayer. "They, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them." (Ezek. ii. 5.)

6. Their *historical value*. All the world knows that the prophecies were recorded at the time of their utterance, or shortly after. They are blended with the histories of those times; they frequently grew out of passing occurrences, and were penned accordingly. Sometimes they referred to events that were to take place in a few days or a year; and sometimes to events a thousand years in the future. But the truthful pen of history—in many instances all-unconscious of the prevenient predictions—has recorded their fulfillment in hundreds of instances to the very letter. The New Testament is a record of the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. Josephus the Jew records the minute fulfillment of prophecies in both Testaments, though it is not likely that he ever saw a copy of any of the

books of the New Testament. The Roman historians furnish their quota. The infidel Gibbon furnishes his. Medals, monuments, manuscripts (which are almost daily coming to light), contribute theirs. The evidence is cumulative; it waxes stronger and stronger as the years and centuries and millenniums pass by. The prophecies, of course, are objectively the same in every age, but they wax subjectively greater by the lapse of time. If it is thought that miracles grow dim by age, the reverse is true of prophecy, which is all the more valuable and convincing as it is the farther removed from the age of the prophet. This principle did not escape the notice of the great author of the "Analogy." He says:

> As neither the Jewish nor Christian revelation has been universal, and as they have been afforded to a greater or less part of the world, at different times, so likewise, at different times, both revelations have had different degrees of evidence. The Jews who lived during the succession of prophets, that is, from Moses till after the captivity, had higher evidence of the truth of their religion than those who lived in the interval between the last-mentioned period and the coming of Christ. And the first Christians had higher evidence of the miracles wrought in attestation of Christianity

than what we have now. They had also a strong presumptive proof of the truth of it, perhaps of much greater force in way of argument than many think, of which we have very little remaining. I mean the presumptive proof of its truth from the influence which it had upon the lives of the generality of its profession. And we, or future ages, may possibly have a proof of it which they could not have, *from the conformity between the prophetic history and the state of the world, and of Christianity.*[7]

The recorded fulfillment, as well as the current and accumulating fulfillment, is a standing proof of their divine original, and of the inspiration of those who delivered them.

§ 6. Objections Answered.

1. Infidels have attempted to break the force of the demonstration of the truth of the Scriptures afforded by the prophecies, by putting them in the same rank with heathen oracles. But these are so few and occult and nebulous that they have passed into a proverb for equivocation.

The prophecies of Scripture in hundreds of cases are plain as writing can be: they cannot be misunderstood. In some cases they are obscure, so as not to impinge on human freedom, or not to induce men to endeavor to frustrate them, or not to provoke needless persecution, as in the case of the Apocalyptic prophecies

concerning the Roman power, Rev. xiii., or those of a similar kind in 2 Thess. ii.

The priests at Delphi and at other oracular shrines only gave guesses concerning proximate events, and were as often wrong as right. The prophets predicted events that were near and also those that were a thousand years in the future, and with equal ease and absolute certainty.

The venality, wealth, and servility of the heathen oracles were proverbial. Demosthenes publicly charged the Delphic oracle with being bribed to the interests of Philip. The Greek historians cite instances in which the oracle was corrupted; and they state that the prophetesses sometimes prophesied for money and sometimes for lewdness! And yet they are to be paralleled with the truth-loving, self-sacrificing prophets of the Lord, who could not be moved by smiles or frowns, promises of reward or threatenings of dungeons

and death, which many of them endured, sealing their testimony with their blood!

2. It is further objected that Montanists, Pre-millenarian Adventists, Anabaptists, Millerites, and other fanatics or impostors, have professed to draw their inspiration from the prophecies—that is to say, some knaves and fools have wrested and abused the prophecies; therefore the prophecies are useless or mischievous, and ought not to be studied or accredited! Is there a single fact or doctrine in Scripture that has not been abused? Is there a single principle in philosophy that has not been abused? Is there any thing in the world—physical, mental, moral—that has not been abused? That is a sufficient answer to objections so sophistical.

3. Prophecy is not to be thrown aside as unimportant. If it is "a faithful saying"—as we have shown—"it is worthy of all acceptation." What is said of the obscurest of the prophecies may be said of all: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." (Rev. i. 3.) And why blessed? Many reasons may be given, but one will suffice: The prophecies being duly heeded, when placed alongside of their fulfillment, furnish an overwhelming demonstration of the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures in which they are contained.

§ 7. The Work and Witness of the Holy Spirit.

The third overwhelming demonstration of the authenticity of the Scriptures is the work and witness of the Holy Spirit.

492

1. The work wrought by the Spirit attests the inspiration of the Scriptures.

Take one illustration. John the Baptist predicted that the Messiah, who was just about to make his appearance, should baptize his disciples with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Just before his passion, Jesus repeatedly told his disciples that ho would send them the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who should endow them with plenary inspiration, even to the extent of foretelling future events. Just before his ascension he repeated and emphasized his prediction, saying to them: "Wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but

ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts i. 4–8.) Just ten days after this the Holy Ghost descended upon them with visible tokens of his presence and power. "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Acts ii. 3, 4.) By this endowment from on high they were able to speak with tongues they had never learned: they were able to perform astounding miracles; they were able to utter veritable prophecies; and they were so empowered to preach that they could say to those to whom they ministered: "Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." (1 Thess. i. 5.) "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.) Now read the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, and see the proof of all this. Jews and Gentiles were converted by myriads to the faith, and they were endowed with miraculous and prophetic *charismata* in addition to the ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, so that they could as well doubt their existence as the divinity of the holy gospel they professed. They had an unction from the Holy One, and they knew all things pertaining to Christianity with a divine plerophory, or assurance of their truth. Then read the developments

of Christianity in after ages, its miraculous preservation amid persecutions and corruptions which threatened to sweep it from the earth: yet here it is to-day, strong and vigorous as ever, going on conquering and to conquer, and it will go forward till all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. Is not this a demonstration of the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures?

Speaking of "the happy organization of a well-governed society," that is, the Church organized on the principles contained in the Bible, Coleridge says, in his "Lay Sermon:"

> But whence did this organization first come? Was it a tree transplanted from Paradise, with all its branches in full fruitage? Or was it sowed in

sunshine? Was it in vernal breezes and gentle rains that it fixed its roots, and grew and strengthened? Let history answer these questions. With blood was it planted; it was rocked in tempests; the goat, the ass, and the stag gnawed it; the wild boar has whetted his tusks on its bark. The deep scars are still extant on its trunk, and the path of the lightning may be traced among its higher branches. And even after its full growth, in the season of its strength, when its height reached to the heavens, and the sight thereof to all the earth, the whirlwind has more than once forced its stately head to touch the ground; it has been bent like a bow, and sprung back like a shaft.[8]

Nourished by the divine word, and Him who inspired it, that tree shall still bring forth fruit in old age; it grows more fat and flourishing as the ages roll on.

2. Then the witness of the Spirit in the believer's experience demonstrates the inspiration of the sacred waitings. But as this is a matter which more concerns the believer and his confirmation in the faith than the unbeliever, who, as the natural man, discerneth not these spiritual things, we shall not dwell upon it in this place. It has been discussed in other relations. We may say, however, that our Lord's challenge is pertinent and pregnant: "If any will—is disposed, resolved, determined—to do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (John vii. 17.) That is honest and fair. Let any man search the Scriptures with a docile, prayerful, earnest spirit, and the Holy Ghost, by whom they were inspired, will soon show him their consistency, sublimity, beauty, purity, power, and consequent truth. Let him yield to that influence,

and he will be brought to repentance. Let him concur with the gracious operation, and he will be brought to the cross, and "being justified by faith, he will have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "The Spirit itself shall bear witness with his spirit that he is a child of God." The same Spirit, on the same condition, will sanctify his nature, will sustain him in weakness, comfort him in trouble, and bring him off at last more than a conqueror over sin, death, and hell, through Him that hath loved us. Verily, if this is not an overwhelming demonstration to others it is to him by whom it is experienced!

§ 8. Conclusion.

[Lastly, there is a high ground to be taken by a believer in the Christian revelation, that is by one who trusts in Jesus, which being taken must not be left for a moment. To this we have referred again and again: it is the conclusion of the whole matter. He came up out of the Old Testament with the Old Testament in his hand; and made the voices of Moses and the ancient prophets his own voice. Long after the representatives of the old economy vanished on the mount, leaving *him* alone whom all must hear, he expressly summed up their testimony as borne to himself from first to last: "beginning at Moses and at all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 27.) He made no exception and no reservation. The frame-work of our living Saviour is the Holy Bible: he is set in it. The believer in Christ, the eternal Oracle of God, receives the Scriptures from his hands as clothed with a divine authority; if it were not so, if the divine unction failed to descend upon any part of them, he would have told us. He has no doubt, he must have no doubt, that the inspiring Spirit has deposited in the Church a true testimony of the history of redemption. Whilst the attack and the defense are going on, it is his wisdom to wait in tranquil confidence. He must not take alarm and capitulate. He must not abandon the outworks, nor intrench himself in the supposed Bible within the Bible, in the supposed Spirit in the letter. He must not do this, because the Christian revelation is bound up with its Two Testaments; and he may be sure that the Holy Ghost will support him and honor him in his fidelity to the Records of his Faith.[9]]

---

1. Pope, "Compendium," etc., Vol. I., pp. 52–57.↩
2. Huther, following the rigid grammatical principles laid down by Meyer on Eph. ii. 21, emphatically repudiates the translation "the whole of Scripture" (Beza, as cited above, p. 446, "*tota scriptura*"); but Dr. J. H. Thayer, in his Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (N.Y.: Harper & Bros., 1887), our latest and best authority, under this meaning of πᾶς, "the whole (all, Lat. *totus*)" cites 2 Tim. iii. 16, πᾶσα γραφή, and adds that the expression is nearly equivalent to ὅσα προεγράφη, "whatsoever things were written aforetime," in Rom. xv. 4. Middleton's rule, of course, in general holds good, πᾶς with anarthrous nouns meaning "any, every one," and with nouns having the article signifying "the whole." Πᾶσα πόλις, for example, means "every city;" but πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, "the whole city." But before proper names of countries and cities (see Winer, p. 111), and before collective terms, even when anarthrous, the meaning "the whole" holds good. In the class of collective terms Thayer places πᾶσα γραφή, and cites also Acts ii. 36, πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, which both the authorized and revised versions

translate “all the house of Israel,” though the revisers, not willing wholly to suppress a doubt, add in the margin, “or, *every house*.” But in Col. i. 15, the revisers deliberately, and without any reserve, translate πάσης κτίσεως “of all creation,” substituting this rendering for the authorized “of every creature.” Κτίσις here seems to mean the aggregate of created things—what we mean by “nature.” Dr. Thayer extends this usage of πᾶς with anarthrous nouns to some other cases, as Acts xvii. 26, where the true text, according to Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, is ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς, and not, as in the *textus receptus*, ἐπὶ παν τὸ πρόσωπου. Here the obviously correct translation, as both versions agree, is “on all the face of the earth.” Eph. ii. 21 is more doubtful, though here Thayer is supported by Winer, who says distinctly (p. 111) that “since the Church of Christ as a whole is spoken of, *the whole building* is the proper translation” of πᾶσα οἰκοδομή. The revisers, however, translate “each several building,” and are strongly supported by Meyer, who says, “The admissibility of the anarthrous form πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, in the sense of ‘the whole building,’ cannot be at all conceded, since οἰκοδομή is neither a proper name, nor to be regarded as equivalent to such.” He lays down the close rule, “In general πᾶς in the sense of *whole* can only be without an article, when the substantive to which it belongs would not need the article even without πᾶς.”—T.↩

3. For a broad, solid, and eminently satisfactory discussion of the inspiration of the New Testament see an article with this title in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1880, by President Bartlett, of Dartmouth.—T.↩
4. One of the most ingenious of Kant’s treatises is the one entitled “Religion Within the Bounds of Pure Reason,” in which he attempts the reduction of religion to morality. Kant defines religion to be the recognition of all our duties as divine commands. When the divine precept is necessary to a knowledge of duty, *i. e.*, is of the nature of positive statute, we have revealed religion. When there is a *prima facie* recognition of duty, and it is regarded as a divine command because it is duty, we have natural religion. The treatise is divided into four parts: (1) of the radical principle of evil in human nature, (2) of the conflict between the good and evil principles, (3) of the victory of the good, and the foundation of the kingdom of God in the world, and (4) of true and false service to God, or religion and priestcraft. This kingdom of God is both invisible and visible; as invisible it is the union of all the righteous under the universal moral government of God; as visible, the true Church when realized on earth is (1) as to its quantity, *universal*, (2) as to its quality, *pure*, (3) as to its relation, *free*, “neither a hierarchy nor a democracy, but a

voluntary, universal, and enduring spiritual union," and (4) as to its modality, of *unchangeable constitution*. Every Church has a twofold basis, the revealed, or, in Kantian phraseology, the historico-statutory, and the natural, or the moral faith of the reason. The latter is the element and condition of universality in the Church, while the former is a mere means to an end and is a condescension to human weakness. Whenever the historico-statutory element becomes an independent end, corruption is introduced into the Church, and the reign of mere priestcraft begins. So far as the visible Church realizes the pure faith of the reason the kingdom of God is approximated. This leads to Kant's free handling of the Bible, as noticed in the text. The historical content of the Scriptures is useless and therefore repudiated. The moral reason is the sole interpreter and judge of Revelation. It may require considerable forcing to get universal morality out of some portions, but this is always to be preferred to an empty literalism that contains nothing for morality. When this pure faith of the reason shall wholly absorb the historical, the traditional, and the statutory, the kingdom of God will be established—and the end of the world will be upon us. Such, in brief, is the extraordinary speculation of this profound thinker: in the midst of much chaff there are certainly here some kernels of wheat.—T.↩

5. "Compendium," etc., Vol. I., pp. 182, 183.↩
6. "Christian Dogmatics," pp. 342–344.↩
7. Butler's "Analogy," II. 6.↩
8. Coleridge's Works, I., 432. This magnificent passage adorns one of Bascom's Sermons, and our eloquent and lamented friend frequently used it with great effectiveness.↩
9. Pope, "Compendium," etc., Vol. I., p. 192.↩

Chapter III. Exhaustiveness of the Holy Scriptures.

495
As the Holy Scriptures are pertinent, genuine, and authentic, so they are exhaustive, as a rule of faith. They contain the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. There is nothing redundant, nothing deficient.

§ 1. No Redundancy in the Holy Scriptures.

There is no redundancy in the Holy Scriptures.

1. It is necessary for us to receive all that, upon due proof, appears to be *canonical*. By canonical is here meant authentic and authoritative, as a divine revelation. Thus McClintock and Strong, "Canon of Scripture, as the phrase is usually employed, may be defined as the authoritative standard of religion and morals, composed of those writings which have been given for this purpose by God to man." Says Bishop Browne:

> The word κάνών signifies a line, or rule—a standard, therefore, by which other things are to be judged of. It is applied to the tongue of a balance, or that small part of the scales which by its perpendicular situation determines the even poise or weight, or by its inclination either way, the uneven poise of the things that are weighed. It is applied to the Scriptures because they have ever been esteemed in the Church "the infallible rule of our faith, and the perfect square of our actions, in all things that are in any way needful for our eternal salvation."

Webster, indeed, gives this definition:

> Canonical books, or canonical Scriptures, those books of the Scriptures which are admitted by the canons of the Church to be of divine origin. The Roman Catholic Church admits the Apocryphal books to be canonical, the Protestants reject them.

We have no use for this definition.[1] Burnet, speaking of the reading of the Apocryphal books in the primitive Church, says:

496
These therefore being usually read, they came to be reckoned among canonical scriptures; for this is the reason assigned in the Third Council of Carthage for calling them canonical, because they had received them from

their fathers as books that were to be read in churches; and the word canonical was by some in those ages used in a large sense; in opposition to spurious so that it signified no more than that they were genuine.

We have already seen that a book may be genuine, and yet not authentic, or indeed pertinent, as a rule of faith, and so not authoritative—the sense in which the word canonical is used in this article.

We have shown that we are not to wait till we discover the importance of any book, or part of a book, before we consider it necessary to accept it as canonical. We are not competent judges in the premises. If King Alfonso had been consulted by the Creator, the world would have been very different from what He made it: perhaps, however, it would not have been any better. So if we were consulted concerning the canon of Scripture—what should and what should not be recognized as canonical—the Bible might be much smaller or much larger than it is, but it might be questionable whether it would be any better.

2. The secular parts of the Bible—so to distinguish them—are ancillary to the spiritual, and are therefore necessary. There has been a great deal of contemptible quibbling on this subject. The Bible might have been gotten up in the form of a catechism, merely developing the three great theological virtues, faith, hope, and love, as containing all things necessary to salvation; but in that form would it have been more self-evidencing, more attractive, more useful? Man might live by bread and water alone; life could be sustained without flesh, fish, or fowl, or the usual variety of vegetables, beverages, and condiments; but

would the physical, or indeed the intellectual and moral, part of our nature be so well developed and sustained by such a meager diet as by one more varied and generous? The objector does not object to a philosophical work because it is enriched, and enlivened, and adorned by pertinent passages of an historical, biographical, or poetical character, or with occasional scintillations of wit, gleams of humor, and outbursts of eloquence. The physician knows the value of adjuvants which in themselves have no curative power, and so does his patient. By judicious coloring, coating, scenting, flavoring, he so “exhibits” his potions as to make them less repulsive to the patient, and better adapted to produce the desired result. The jeweler recognizes this principle. His precious stone is made more

attractive by skillful setting. It is so with the *Koh-i-noor* of inspired truth. It shines more brilliantly when it is set in the Bible than anywhere else. We want the ancillary and adjuvant portions of Scripture—geographical, topographical, archaeological, philosophical, proverbial, poetical, prophetical, anecdotal, historical, biographical: all these serve to attract the young and old to the study of the Bible, while they illustrate, confirm, and enforce its salutary truths. Indeed, that which is brought as an objection to the Bible is one of its grand recommendations.

§ 2. No Deficiency in the Holy Scriptures.

There is no deficiency in the Holy Scriptures.

This may be assumed, if the Scriptures are, as proved, a divine revelation. God intended them as the only rule and the sufficient rule of our faith and practice, and there is no limitation of his resources to occasion a defect in his revelation.

This is positively affirmed in the Scriptures themselves. We need only allude to that great classical text to which we have already given so much attention, 2 Tim. iii. 15–17. But we may profitably add, that if David's Bible, which in his day and dispensation was comparatively small, was yet large enough for his salvation; and Timothy's Bible, which was larger than David's, subserved all his wants; our Bible, which is larger than Timothy's and much larger than David's, will subserve all our wants in this last and perfect dispensation of God's will. As it would be sacrilegious to take away any thing that is written in this Book, so it would be weakness and wickedness extreme to add a

word to it. How preposterous, to eke out the wisdom of God by the ignorance of man! This is attested by experience.

All who have made the Scriptures their study have found them ample enough for all their wants. They are an inexhaustible mine. They contain unsearchable riches. It must be borne in mind that the Scriptures were not given simply to gratify curiosity. Indeed, this is but a secondary, a very subordinate consideration. To accomplish this end, the whole world could not contain the books that would be written. There are thousands of things connected with religion that are not important for us to know in the present probationary

state. The reticence of revelation in regard to them constitutes a part of our "trial." It suggests to us the paramount importance for our present needs of those things that are revealed, and stimulates us to make a good use of them for practical purposes, and encourages us to look forward to another state of existence when we shall be made acquainted with subjects not necessary, not proper for us to know in the present state. But every one who has duly tested the Scriptures has found that they "are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus," and that they "are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." There never was a docile, devout student of the Bible who felt the need of resorting to the Veda, the Koran, or any other human production, to eke out the teaching of inspiration in regard to the science of salvation, whatever assistance he might need from men more learned and experienced than himself in expounding the sacred records.

It is worthy of note that ministers need no other text-book. It is not necessary that preachers should always take a text, that is, a small portion of Scripture, as the motto or the theme of their sermons. Still, the custom is convenient, whenever or by whomsoever it was introduced, or how much soever it may have been abused. One is sometimes almost inclined to think that the Bible was framed with special reference to this method. The sacred writers might not have thought of it; but He who inspired them knew what use would have to be made of their writings. Every day, especially every Lord's-day, thousands of preachers resort to this prolific book of themes for texts on

which to preach; and it never fails them. It yields passages suitable to every subject which is proper to be handled in the pulpit. Sometimes, indeed, the Bible does not seem to be big enough for the preacher; but the reason is a subjective one: it is to be sought in himself. He is dull and stupid, and no textbook would serve him. Or he is curious, eccentric, sensational: we are tempted to think that Dr. Sam. Parr (the only Protestant that occurs to us who went beyond the canonical books for a text) had a little affectation when he took a text from Maccabees. It is something more, and a great deal worse, than affectation in a Romish priest when he takes a text for a funeral sermon from 2 Macc. xii., which says that Judas

prayed for the dead—"a holy and good thought, whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin." Does that sound like Scripture? There are certain popular, proverbial *gnomes* which would do very well for texts of sermons, *e. g.*: "God tempers the wind to the shorn lamb;" "Spare the rod, spoil the child;" and that weighty sentence from the Burial Service, "In the midst of life, we are in death," which Robert Hall took for a text, though an Episcopal friend told him in time where it is, and where it is not found, to save him from embarrassment in the pulpit! Such maxims are drawn from the Bible, and, as every preacher knows, they are not needed for texts.

This excludes all additions to the rule of faith. The Romanists are the prime offenders in this matter. They have made a sixfold addition to the rule of faith. This greatly complicates the controversies with Rome. If popish polemics, like Protestants, would make canonical Scripture the judge to end the strife, the strife might soon be ended.

I. The Apocrypha.

§ 1. The Books So Designated.

The first great addition to the rule is what is called the Apocrypha. This word comes from the Greek, from ἀπό, from, and κρύπτειν, to hide. These books, according to many authorities, are so called either because their authors were unknown or because they were not laid up like the canonical books in the ark, or because they were read in private only; though it seems from

Canon xlviii. of the Council of Carthage that some Apocryphal books were read publicly.[2]

Mr. Wesley eliminated that part of Article VI. which refers to the Apocryphal books, and gives their names. He did this because he did not want them read in the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, as some of them are read in the Church of England. Here is the omitted passage:

> And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life, and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them

to establish any doctrine: such are these following: The Third Book of Esdras, The Fourth Book of Esdras, The Book of Tobias, The Book of Judith, The rest of the Book of Hester, The Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch the Prophet, The Song of the Three Children, The Story of Susanna, Of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses; The First Book of Maccabees, The Second Book of Maccabees.

The Third Book of Maccabees and a Fourth, not here given, are not found in the usual English recensions of the Apocrypha. They are worthless. It is unfortunate that the early Church and the Church of England appointed any of these books to be read in churches. Wheatly makes this apology:

After all the canonical books of the Old Testament are read through, to supply the remainder of the year, several books of the Apocrypha are appointed to be read, which, though not canonical, have yet been allowed, by the judgment of the Church for many ages past, to be ecclesiastical and good, nearest to divine of any writings in the world. For which reason the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees were recommended by the Council of Carthage to be publicly read in the Church. And Rufinus testifies that they were all in use in his time, though not with an authority equal to that of the canonical books. And that the same respect was paid to them in later ages, Isidore Hispalensis and Robanus Maurus both affirm. In conformity to so general a practice, the Church of England still continues the use of these books in her public service; though not with any design to lessen the authority of canonical Scripture, which she expressly affirms to be the only rule of faith; declaring that the Church doth read the other books for example of life, and instruction of manners, but yet doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. Nor is there any one Sunday in the whole year that has any of its lessons taken out of the Apocrypha. For as the greatest assemblies of Christians are upon those days, it is wisely ordered that they should then be instructed out of the undisputed word of God. And even on the week-days the sacred lessons are constantly taken out of canonical Scripture, which

one would think should be enough to silence our adversaries; especially as there is more canonical Scripture read in our churches in any two months (even though we should except the Psalms, Epistles, and Gospels) than is in a whole year in the largest of their meetings.

We are not set for the defense of the Puritans, yet we cannot but note the sophistry in this *ad hominem* argument. All the world knows that Puritans were far more devoted to the Scriptures than were Prelatists; indeed, the latter have sometimes ridiculed them as bibliolaters. The Puritans labored assiduously to multiply copies of

the Bible, and to circulate them everywhere, enjoining the people to search the Scriptures at their homes, and to live upon the inspired word: hence their great familiarity with the Scriptures. They did not read so much of the Bible in their religious assemblies, because they laid great stress upon preaching as an ordinance of God. But then their sermons were made up largely of compilations from the Scriptures.

At the Savoy Conference, the Bishops said in their reply to the Puritans' objections to the reading of the Apocrypha in churches:

> As they would have no saints'-days observed by the Church, so no Apocryphal chapter read in the Church; but upon such a reason as would exclude all sermons as well as Apocrypha—namely, because the Holy Scriptures contain in them all things necessary either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practiced. If so, why so many unnecessary sermons? Why any more but reading of Scriptures? If, notwithstanding their sufficiency, sermons be necessary, there is no reason why the Apocryphal chapters should not be as useful—most of them containing excellent discourses and rules of morality. It is heartily to be wished that all sermons were as good. If their fear be that by this means those books may come to be of equal esteem with the Canon, they may be secured against that by the title which the Church hath put upon them, calling them Apocryphal; and it is the Church's testimony which teacheth us this difference, and to leave them out were to cross the practice of the Church in former ages.

This reply is sophistical. No Puritan, no sensible man, ever thought that sermons were not necessary, because the Scriptures are a perfect rule of faith and practice. Philip never intimated to the Eunuch that Isaiah was defective: he only developed the meaning of Isaiah. There is a difference, which a child can see, between the reading of the Scriptures and the preaching of sermons. There is no danger of confounding the latter with the former. But if Apocryphal chapters be read for Scripture lessons, whether in sentences at the communion on Sundays (as

is still done in the Church of England), or as "proper lessons for week-days and saints'-days," there is great danger of confounding them with the canonical Scriptures. Very few of the common people ever read the Sixth Article or have any idea of what the word Apocrypha means. Suppose they heard the priest read 2 Macc. xii. (though happily Maccabees, Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasses are not in the Lectionary), they would certainly conclude, as do the

Romanists when they hear it cited as Scripture, that it is indeed a good and wholesome thing to pray for the dead, and to make offerings for them that they might be released from their sins and consequent punishment. That must indeed be a rare sermon that is no better than the demonology of Tobit, the romance of Judith, the novelette of Susanna, and the mountebank story of Bel and the Dragon: all of which, we are ashamed to say, are appointed to be used as "Scripture Lessons" in the Church of England. Surely those Churches (our own included) which do not read the Apocrypha, as Scripture lessons, need make no apology for the omission.

§ 2. Reasons for Rejection of the Apocryphal Books.

We do not recognize any Apocryphal book as Scripture, for several reasons:

1. The canon of the Old Testament which we have is precisely that which the Jewish Church always recognized, and it does not contain a single Apocryphal book. Dupin, a Roman Catholic historian, cites Jerome to this effect:

> "From hence it follows," says Jerome, "that the book of Wisdom, commonly attributed to Solomon, the Ecclesiasticus of Jesus the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and the Pastor, do not belong to the canon any more than the two books of Maccabees do; one of which was written in Hebrew and the other in Greek, as the style sufficiently shows."

If the Jews had done wrong in excluding these books from the canon, surely Christ, or the Apostles, or the Fathers, would have censured them for so doing.

2. None of these books are found in the Hebrew or Chaldee or Syriac languages. One or two of them may have been written in Syro-Chaldee, but we know nothing of such originals. The second book of Maccabees indeed is not found even in Greek: only in Latin and versions therefrom. But all the canonical books of the Old Testament are extant in the Hebrew, with a few passages in Chaldee. The canon was closed long before

any of the Apocryphal books were written, and next to nothing is known of their authorship.

3. None of these books are quoted in the New Testament or recognized as canonical by the Primitive Church down to A.D. 397.

Not one of them is found in the catalogue of Melito, A.D. 162; nor in that of Origen, A.D. 187; though he alludes to the two books of Maccabees. (See Eusebius, "Ecclesiastical History," iv. 26; vi. 25.) Hagenbach says:

> The more firmly the doctrine of the Church was established, the nearer the canon of the Sacred Scriptures, the principal parts of which had been determined in the times of Eusebius, was brought to its completion. The synods of Laodicea, of Hippo, and the third of Carthage, contributed to this result. The theologians of the Eastern Church distinctly separated the later productions of the Graeco-Jewish literature (*i. e.* the Apocryphal books, *Libri Ecclesiastici*) from the canon of the Old Testament Hebrew national literature. But although Rufinus and Jerome endeavored to maintain the same distinction in the Latin Church, it became the general custom to follow the Africans and Augustin in doing away with the distinction between the canonical and Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and in considering both as one.

How strange that Augustin, who was so great a corrupter of Christianity, should be recognized as "the prince of the Fathers!" Hagenbach continues:

> The Synod of Laodicea was held about the middle of the fourth century. In the 39th canon it was enacted that no uncanonical book should be used in the Churches, and in the 60th a list was given of the canonical books, in Mansi, ii. 574. In this list all the Hebrew writings of the Old Testament are received, and the Apocryphal books excluded (with the exception of the book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah). The synods of Hippo and Carthage number the Apocrypha of the Old Testament among the canonical books. Innocent I. and Gelasius I. confirmed their decisions. Rufinus places the Shepherd of Hermas on the same footing with the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and maintains that they may be read but not quoted as authorities.

The Greek Fathers followed Origen, who made a distinction between the old Hebrew books, which alone are canonical, and those extant only in Greek. Athanasius distinguishes between the canonical (κανονιζόμενα), those worthy of being read, though not canonical (ἀναγινωσκομενα), and the fictitious works of heretics (ἀπόκρυφα). In the first class he put the twenty-two Hebrew books which make the Jewish canon, in the second he put what we call the Apocrypha, and in the third he put the *pseudepigrapha*. The Greek Church still follows this order. The addition of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah by Origen and others to the prophecy of Jeremiah was occasioned by their

being appended to the genuine writings of that prophet in MSS. of the Septuagint. This too will account for the fact that Ambrose, Augustin, and others after them, in the Latin Church, who used the Septuagint, spoke of the Apocryphal books as canonical, because, they were placed with the canonical books, as being in the same language.

From the foregoing it may be seen with what audacity the Council of Trent proceeded when it says of the canonical Scriptures and the Apocrypha:

> Whosoever shall not receive, as sacred and canonical, all these books, and every part of them, as they are commonly read in the Catholic Church, and are contained in the old Vulgate Latin edition, or shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed.

And what impudence in Hughes to say to Breckenridge: "I defy you to show that the Christian Church, previous to Luther, ever held a different canon!"

4. The internal evidence corresponds with the external, in excluding the Apocrypha from the inspired canon. They are marked by triviality of matter and meanness of style. They contradict the Scriptures and one another. They contain anachronisms. They embody false notions borrowed from the Alexandrian philosophy, and also errors in doctrine. They abound in childish conceits, ridiculous romances, and monstrous fables. There are some fine passages and good ethical proverbs in the Sapiential books, and the First Book of Maccabees appears to be in the main a trustworthy history; but for all the rest we have no use, except as they reflect the spirit and tone, the manners and customs and language of the Jews and their neighbors, in post-exile times, and show the contrast between writings inspired and uninspired.

II. Tradition.

The next great addition which the Romanists have made to the rule of faith is Tradition.

§ 1. Tradition Defined.

The Council of Trent says:

Traditions have come down to us, either received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same Apostles under the dictation of the Holy Spirit; that these traditions relate both to faith and morals, have been preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession, are to be received

505

with equal piety and veneration with Scriptures, and whosoever shall knowingly and deliberately despise these traditions is accursed.

Bishop Hay says:

Tradition is the handing down from one generation to another, whether by word of mouth or by writings, those truths revealed by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, which either are not contained in the Holy Scriptures, or at least are not clearly contained in them.

Dr. Milner says that the rule of faith is "Scripture and tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church."

The word tradition (*traditio*, παράδοσις) means, says Parkhurst:

A doctrine or injunction delivered or communicated from one to another, whether divine (1 Cor. xi. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 15—where it is applied to written as well as oral instruction, see MacKnight—iii. 6) or human. (Matt. xv. 2, 3, 6; Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8.) Josephus observes: "The Pharisees have *delivered* to the people, by tradition from the fathers, many injunctions which are not written in the law of Moses, for which reason the sect of the Sadducees rejects them, saying that what are written should be esteemed obligatory, but that they ought not to observe those which come by such tradition." These words agree with what is said of the Pharisees, Mark vii. Stockins, to illustrate Matt. xv. 2, cites from the Talmud, "The words of the scribes are more amiable than the words of the law; for the words of the law are weighty and light, but the words of the scribes are all weighty. The words of the elders are more desirable than the words of the prophets."

The Fathers used the words παράδοσις and *traditio* in the sense of ordinance, precept, or instruction. Thus they speak of the tradition of the apostles, meaning their instruction, as in 2 Thess. ii. 15. *Cf.* Luke i. 2; Acts xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xi. 2, 23; xv. 3, where the verb from which παράδοσις is derived is used in a similar sense. Origen, as rendered by Rufinus, uses the word in this sense: "The Church received from the apostles the *traditionem* injunction, to give baptism to infants."

As might be supposed, the Romanists took advantage of this use of the word to countenance their heresy. But the sophistry is

easily exposed. All that the inspired apostles delivered, whether by writing or word of mouth, that is, by written or unwritten tradition, was of binding authority. But after their age nothing but what was written by them and their associates, with their approval, and by divine inspiration, is binding upon any. This will appear from several considerations.

§ 2. Tradition Excluded and Forbidden by the Scriptures.

The Scriptures assert their own sufficiency and forbid any addition

506

to their authoritative declarations. This excludes all unwritten traditions. Thus Calvin in his "Institutes:"

I hear the answer which they make—that their traditions are not from themselves, but from God; for that the Church is directed by the Holy Spirit, so that it cannot err; and that they are in possession of his authority. When this point is gained, it immediately follows, that their traditions are the revelations of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be despised without impiety and contempt of God. That they may not appear to attempt any thing without high authorities, they wish it to be believed that the greatest part of their observances have descended from the apostles; and they contend that one example sufficiently shows what was the conduct of the apostles in other cases, when being assembled together in a council, they determined and announced to all Gentiles that they should abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled. (Acts xv. 28, 29.) Does not that law which was once given to the Church remain forever in force? "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." (Deut. xii. 32.) And again: "Add not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Prov. xxx.) Since they cannot deny these things to have been spoken to the Church, do they not declare the rebellion of the Church when they pretend that, notwithstanding such prohibitions, it has dared to mingle additions of its own with the doctrine of God? There is nothing involved, nothing intricate, nothing ambiguous, in these words, by which the whole Church is forbidden to add any thing to the word or to diminish any thing from it, in any question relating to the worship of God and his salutary precepts. But it will be alleged that this was spoken exclusively of the law which has been succeeded by the prophecies and the whole dispensation of the gospel. This I certainly admit, and at the same time assert that these were accomplishments of the law, rather than additions to it, or

retrenchments of it. But if the Lord suffered no enlargement or diminution of the ministry of Moses, notwithstanding it was enveloped in such great obscurity, till he dispensed a clearer doctrine by his servants the prophets, and finally by his beloved Son, why do not we consider ourselves far more severely prohibited from making any addition to the law, the prophets, the psalms, and the gospel? No change has taken place in the Lord, who long ago declared that nothing was so highly offensive to him as to attempt to worship him with the inventions of men. For this reason we freely censure that tyranny of human traditions which is imposed upon the world under the name of the Church.

§ 3. Tradition Uncertain and Useless.

But tradition is not only forbidden as a rule of faith; it is uncertain, and therefore useless.

This is clear as a principle. It is difficult, not to say impossible, that any man, without inspiration, can transmit any statement to others, and they again to others, without materially modifying it. We have heard reports of our own sayings and doings which have astounded us with their prodigious misstatements when there was no motive to misrepresent us. Every man

has experience of this. Trust to tradition, indeed! What is the worth of anecdotal literature? Perhaps not one anecdote in a thousand that have been compiled by anecdote-mongers is positively true. We have looked into this matter with some care, and we solemnly avow that we do not give credit to one out of all the traditions about the apostles that have been handed down to us by ecclesiastical historians. We absolutely know nothing of what Christ and the apostles said and did beyond what is recorded in the New Testament. Some of the earliest traditions have an air of credibility —that is all. Shall such be admitted with the Scriptures as an infallible rule of faith?

§ 4. Many Traditions Puerile.

Many of these traditions are puerile. If you want specimens look into the “Gospel of the Infancy,” and other books of the Apocryphal New Testament, in which the traditions, at first oral,

were recorded. Look at that contemptible forgery, the correspondence of Jesus and Abgar, King of Edessa, which some of our day accredit as genuine! Look at all the additions to the sacraments and the *cultus* of the Church which have crystallized into the mummeries enjoined by Rome on the ground of tradition. Then read what Eusebius says ("Ecclesiastical History," iii. 39), about that "weak brother" and notorious old gossip, Papias, who is *facile princeps* in this line. Do such traditions constitute an infallible rule of faith?

§ 5. Many Traditions False.

Many of these traditions are notoriously false. Witness the fables reported by Justin and others concerning Simon Magus; how that he went to Rome in the reign of Claudius Caesar, performed many magic rites by the operation of demons, was honored with a statue as god in an island in the Tiber, between the two bridges, bearing the superscription in Latin *Simoni Deo Sancto*—"To Simon, the Holy God." Justin says he saw it! He seems to have mistaken a statue to *Semo*, a Sabine god, for one to Simon, as a piece of marble has been found in an island of the Tiber inscribed *Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum*. Eusebius (ii. 13, 14) reports other fables of Simon and his associate, Helen the prostitute, and how he had an encounter with Simon Peter and came to grief. He cites Justin and Irenaeus as authority. Irenaeus appears to have been a good man, but a great gossip.

He wrote a treatise, says Eusebius, on the Ogdrad, or the number eight, in which he shows that he was the first who received the succession from the apostles! In a letter to Florinus he recalls things which took place when he was a boy, as he said he could remember the events of those times better than more recent occurrences. Then after repeating traditions about Polycarp and St. John, he says: "These things, by the mercy of God and the opportunity then afforded me, I attentively heard, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and these same facts I am always in the habit, by the grace of God, to recall faithfully to mind." How these snow-balls must have increased by this continual rolling! Judge from this what importance is to be attached to the tradition of Irenaeus that John

was banished to Patmos in the reign of Domitian (not in that of Nero, when it probably took place), and that Jesus taught after he was forty years of age—a tradition, he says, which was current in his day as coming from the apostle John, alluding to what the Jews said to Jesus: "Thou art not yet fifty years old" (John viii.). He professed also to give the very words of Jesus, and proof that he was to reign a thousand years upon the earth in corporeal splendor! He was well-nigh as great a gossip as Papias, who says in his "Interpretation of our Lord's Declarations" that he wrote from memory—having been accustomed to *interview* any one who had seen the apostles to ascertain what they had said—for, says he, naively, "I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voice of those that are still surviving." Eusebius says that Justin says that Papias says he received many things by "unwritten tradition, likewise certain parables of our Lord, and of his doctrine, and some other things rather too fabulous." Eusebius specifies his millennial dreams, which, because of the antiquity of the man, were received by Irenaeus and others; "for," Eusebius significantly adds, "he was very limited in his comprehension, as is evident from his discourses." And this is tradition: this we are to receive as of equal authority with the inspired Scriptures. We have referred to these fables, as handed down by the fathers of the Church: we have not referred to the lying stories found in the Apocryphal gospels, the works of heretics, etc. But they are tradition!

§ 6. Many Traditions Heretical.

Many of the traditions are heretical. One of the most ancient

509

and most cherished was that reported by Papias concerning the corporeal reign of Christ upon the earth, with his saints, for a thousand years. It is amazing how that heresy spread and how long it kept its hold in the primitive Church—indeed, it has been cropping out in every age down to the present, a convention of Premillenarian Adventists having been held in New York as lately as October, 1878, notwithstanding its refutation and repudiation by Origen, Augustin, and other Fathers, and the later doctrines of the Church, including Confessions, as, for example, the Augsburg and

Anglican in the days of Edward. Romanists claim tradition for all their heresies, as purgatory, praying to and for the dead, angelolatry, Mariolatry, transubstantiation, adoration of the host, baptismal regeneration, auricular confession, immaculate conception of the Virgin, and the supremacy and infallibility of the pope, this last being grounded on the fable that Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, when there is no proof that he ever was at Rome, and if he ever was there, it must have been for a short time, and the episcopate was incompatible with the apostolate. But it is useless to enumerate the heresies which claim the authority of tradition: their name is legion. Open the flood-gates of tradition, and the Church will be deluged with heresy and its never-failing attendants, superstition in worship, and immorality in life. (Mark vii. 5–9; Col. ii. 8).

§ 7. Does Tradition Supply the Canon of Scripture?

But Romanists and High-church Anglicans tell us that there are some indispensable things for which we are indebted to tradition—among others the Canon of Scripture. They tell us that we should not know what books are canonical—indeed, we should have no canonical books—but for tradition.

This objection we answer, first, by concession. It is a self-evident truth that if there had been none to receive the sacred books, and to hand them down to us, from generation to generation, we should not have known what books are canonical, and we should not have come in possession of any of them—that is, unless God had fallen upon the plan of working miracles from age to age; but that is not God's method. God's plan is set forth in Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6: "For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children:

that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children." Instead of saying any thing against tradition of this sort, we lay great stress upon it and make good use of it. The Church is in that sense the pillar and ground, the witness and depositary, of the truth.[3] Those who received the lively oracles given by divine

revelation and inspiration bore witness to the same: they alone were competent to do so. They transmitted these "written traditions" to others, and they again to others, and so down to our times, and we in our turn are multiplying copies of those sacred traditions, sending them unto all the world, in all languages, and transmitting them to the generation that shall follow us:

That year to year, and age to age,
Might safe convey the sacred page;
And still his truth perpetual run,
Transmitted down from sire to son.

But even in this regard the utmost care has had to be taken lest the wood, hay, and stubble of tradition should be incorporated with the gold, silver, and precious stones. How this has been done we have already shown.

But then we answer, secondly, in opposition to the objection: we are not indebted to tradition for any thing but the safe transmission of duly accredited divine communications, committed to writing at the very time in which they were given. We are indebted to the Jewish Church for the safe transmission of the Old Testament Scriptures; but what has that to do with "the traditions of the elders?" Cannot we reject the latter, while we accept the former? Can we consistently recognize those

puerile, contradictory, and immoral traditions, if we acknowledge the authority of the Law and the Prophets? So of the New Testament Scriptures. We are indebted to those who first received the sacred writings from the apostles and evangelists for safely preserving them; to those who copied from the autographs; to those who translated them into various languages; to those who multiplied copies of those translations, notwithstanding the unavoidable errors in translation and transcription; to those who in our day have multiplied them by the printing press, so that everybody in Christendom may have a copy "in his own tongue, wherein he was born;" and to the zeal and liberality manifested by the Church in sending those divine oracles to every kindred and every tongue upon the face of the earth. But what has all this to do with unwritten traditions, which, as we have seen, are puerile, contradictory, false, and heretical? Cannot we accept the former, while we reject the latter? Can we consistently recognize these

childish fables and pious frauds, if we acknowledge the authority of the Gospels and Epistles? Here are the writings of John Wesley, in seven volumes, edited by Thomas Jackson of London, and reprinted in America. We are not only indebted to Wesley for writing those works, but also to those who received them from his hands for printing and publishing them, first in small volumes and tracts, at different times, and then for collecting them together, and carefully collating and printing and publishing them in this form, and multiplying copies of them, so that we have the benefit of their perusal. Call this tradition if you please, and say we are indebted to it for Wesley's Works. But suppose on the strength of this some one who knew some one who knew some one who knew John Wesley should repeat certain anecdotes concerning John Wesley, relating to some things which it was reported that he said and did, which are not recorded in his Journals and other works, and which are reprinted by his biographers as facts with which they were conversant, must we believe them, because we recognize the writings of John Wesley which are duly authenticated and obviously genuine? Can we trust the eyes and ears of the first parties in this chain of testimony? If so, can we trust the ears and apprehension and speech of the second parties in this chain? If so, are we sure that those who reported the stories thus transmitted left out nothing, added

nothing, colored nothing, exaggerated nothing? Nay, are we not morally certain that they did vary in the recital? They say that Mr. Wesley once met a man on the pavement, who forced him to the outside, stating that he never gave way for a fool, and that Mr. Wesley calmly took the outside and said, "I do." That savors of the "salt" which the Apostle recommends us to use on occasion (Col. iv. 6), and it may have occurred; but am I as sure of it as I am that he translated Terstugen's immortal hymn, "Thou hidden love of God, whose height," which Wesley himself tells us he translated when in Savannah? We could not doubt the latter if we knew he wrote, as Matthew wrote, by inspiration; we can hardly doubt it in view of his well-established reputation for truth and sobriety; but we might very well doubt it, if we had no other evidence for it than some traditional rumor, originating we know not where, we know not when, we know not with whom. So we receive the well-authenticated records of the life and death of Jesus Christ and the

Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, while we scarcely credit any unwritten traditions about them, we doubt capitally concerning the truth of most of them, and repudiate others of them as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

§ 8. Is Tradition Our Authority for the Lord's-day?

It is said that we get all our authority for the observance of the Lord's-day from tradition. We do no such thing. We follow the recorded custom of the apostles and first Christians, who met together for religious purposes on the first day of the week, which they called "the Lord's-day," in honor of his resurrection from the dead. (John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10.) We are grateful, indeed, to find, not from unwritten tradition, but from undoubted writings of the Fathers, that in the age succeeding the apostolic, the Church continued this custom, and that it has been observed down to our times. They did not, as the New Testament does not, call the Lord's-day the Sabbath: Justin, Tertullian, and others, call it "Sunday," and so do most of the Teutonic and Latin peoples; but they observed it with sabbatic reverence. Christians of Jewish origin for a good while continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath also; but it was not considered obligatory any more than circumcision, as the apostle says. (Col. ii. 16, 17; Rom. xiv. 10, 13.) The

Gentile believers did not, for the most part, observe the seventh-day Sabbath, but they did keep the Lord's-day; and for the omission of the one and the observance of the other, they had the authority and example of the inspired apostles. We are pleased to know that primitive traditions are with the inspired writings in regard to the Lord's-day; but we do not observe it on the ground of the former, but on that of the latter.

§ 9. Is Tradition the Warrant for Infant Baptism?

So of infant baptism. The Church of England says, "The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." It would, indeed, be

unaccountable if it were not sanctioned by primitive tradition, and if it were not inculcated in the writings of the Fathers, where we find it, in the works of Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Gregory Nazianzen, Pelagius, Celestius, Augustin, and others who say no one ever doubted it. Origen (A.D. 187) says, "the Church received from the apostles the tradition to baptize infants"—where the word tradition means, as we have seen, ordinance or injunction, as in 1 Cor. xi. 2. So that the question is impertinent, "Should we baptize children if we had not these patristic testimonies?" We might as well be asked would we celebrate the Lord's-supper if the Fathers had not assured us that it was duly celebrated in their day? It is not a supposable case that these ordinances would not be observed in the ages succeeding the apostolic; though it is supposable that they might be, as they certainly were, considerably modified in the mode of their celebration. We get our authority for baptizing infants from the Scriptures, from what they do say, and from what they do not say, in the premises, as papists as well as antipedobaptists know perfectly well—at least, they know what we claim, which is all that is necessary for the present argument.

§ 10. Is Tradition the Warrant for Episcopacy?

Then comes the episcopacy. Are we not dependent upon tradition for this? Not on unwritten tradition, for the works of the Fathers abound with references to it. In some instances, *e. g.*, the Ignatian Epistles, they have been interpolated with lying additions to make the Episcopate conform to the popish and High-church style. But as to episcopacy—meaning by it an

office or grade in the ministry above the presbyterate—everybody knows that it obtained in the post-apostolic Church; there is no uncertain tradition about it. Jerome tells us how it originated, and we can trace its development into a Roman prelacy and popedom, century by century. There it is in ecclesiastical history. But ought we to recognize it if it is not in the Scriptures? We certainly ought not to recognize it as of binding force if it has nothing to depend on but uncertain tradition, or indeed the writings of the Fathers, or the *dicta* of the Church. It is very certain that presbyter and bishop are identical in the New Testament. Still there are hints and germs of an

episcopacy above the presbyterate, though not distinguished by that name in the New Testament, *e. g.*, Rev. ii.; iii.—enough to warrant the adoption of that form of government for the Church after the inspired apostles and evangelists had passed away; and it was natural enough for the Church everywhere to adopt it. It is no valid objection to it that it is not prescribed in the New Testament: it is not proscribed, but rather favored, and as no precise system of Church polity is laid down in the Scriptures, the Church was at liberty to develop that which seemed most expedient, in conformity with the general principles laid down in the Scriptures. Hence episcopacy. Those who reject it say truly there is no command for it. Those who receive it have no need to plead tradition for it; they adopt it because they think it on the whole the best form of Church polity, most in accordance with the spirit of the New Testament, and, properly guarded, as with us, no more liable to abuse than any other form. It is indeed no objection to it that it prevailed universally in the Church in the age succeeding that of the apostles, though that with us is a subordinate reason for its retention. As it does not pertain to dogma, and is not positively enjoined, we would rather dispense with it altogether than develop it into the monstrous proportions of the Romish prelacy, and some others, and to make it, as transmitted by an uninterrupted tactual succession, a *sine qua non* for the Christian ministry and Church. That is monstrous, indeed. That is putting tradition, obscure and mendacious tradition, in the same rank with Holy Scripture: this it has been our object and effort to refute and condemn. John Wesley, who was a great advocate for episcopacy, truly says that such an uninterrupted succession of prelates, *jure divino*, is a fable which no

man could prove a fact. It is only necessary to add that it is one of those traditions of the elders which any man of common attainments can prove to be a fable, fraught with the most appalling consequences. So this, as well as every other *ad hominem* argument of the Romanists and others who plead for tradition as a rule of faith and practice of equal authority with the Scriptures, falls to the ground.

III. Unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

The next great addition to the Rule of Faith made by the Romanists they designate as the “Unanimous Consent of the Fathers.”

By this vague formula is meant that whatever in doctrine, morals, or worship was agreed upon by the Fathers is of as binding authority as holy writ. While we cannot, of course, admit the tenableness of this principle, we run little risk in saying that we will recognize it, so far as to agree to subscribe to all the points on which the Fathers unanimously agreed, provided the converse is involved, that we are to subscribe to nothing beyond; as in this case we fear our creed would be a very short one: more concise than the so-called Apostles’ Creed.

§ 1. Who are the Fathers?

Who are the Fathers? and on what points do they unanimously agree? We have before us what is called “an entire list of the Fathers,” to-wit: “Contemporaries of the Apostles, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp.” These five are called “Apostolic Fathers.” Then follow,

- Papias, A.D. 116
- Justin Martyr, 140
- Dionysius of Corinth, 170
- Tatian, 172
- Hegesippus, 173
- Melito, 177
- Irenaeus, 178
- Athenagoras, 178
- Miltiades, 180
- Theophilus, 181
- Clement of Alexandria, 194
- Tertullian, 200
- Minutius Felix, 210
- Ammonius, 220
- Origen, 230
- Firmilian, 233
- Dionysius of Alexandria, 247
- Cyprian, 248

- Novatus, or Novatian, 251
- Arnobius, 306
- Lactantius, 306
- Alexander of Alexandria, 313
- Eusebius, 315
- Athanasius, 326
- Cyril of Jerusalem, 348
- Hilary, 354
- Epiphanius, 368
- Basil, 370
- Gregory of Nazianzus, 370
- Gregory of Nyssa, 370
- Optatus, 370
- Ambrose, 374
- Philaster, 380
- Jerome, 392
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, 394
- Ruffin, 397
- Augustin, 398
- Chrysostom, 398
- Sulpitius Severus, 401
- Cyril of Alexandria, 412
- Theodoret, 423, and
- Gennadius, 494.

These forty-two are called Primitive

Fathers: added to the Apostolic, we have forty-seven. But as no reason can be assigned for closing the catalogue with Gennadius, A.D. 494, the Latin Church extends it to Gregory the Great, A.D. 604; and the Greek Church to John of Damascus, 754. But here a difficulty arises, as the Romish theologians make the following the criteria of a Church Father: Antiquity, Orthodoxy, Sanctity, and Approval of the Church. Hence Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, and some others, are not called Fathers by the Romish Church, but merely “Ecclesiastical Writers,” because they were not sufficiently orthodox. Eadie, Riddle, Alzog, and others, considerably extend the catalogue. They place the five Apostolic Fathers in one list, and put with them the fragments of Papias, and the anonymous Epistle to Diognetus. In a second list they put the Ante-Nicene

Fathers, beginning with Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, and closing with Lactantius, 320. This list embraces the heterodox, Origen, Tertullian, etc.—nineteen names. In a third list are put the Post-Nicene Fathers, beginning with the heterodox Eusebius Pamphili, who died A.D. 340, and ending with John of Damascus, who wrote about 754. Here are thirty-four names, which, added to the nineteen in the list of Ante-Nicene, and the five in the list of Apostolic Fathers, make fifty-eight; to make round numbers add Papias and the anonymous author of the Epistle to Diognetus, and we have sixty Fathers of the Church. Other and more extended lists are given; stop where you will, the line is necessarily an arbitrary one which divides Fathers from Schoolmen, as well as from mere ecclesiastical writers. Here we have more authors than are found in the canonical Scriptures, and their works are tenfold more bulky. The most complete edition of the Greek and Latin Fathers is that of Migne, "Patrologiae Cursus Completus," which includes all the Latin writers from the apostolic age down to 1216, and the Greeks to 1439: the Latins fill, with the indexes, two hundred and twenty-two volumes imperial octavo, and the Greeks (with Latin versions) one hundred and sixty-seven volumes of the same size! But the works of the Greek and Latin Fathers, in which the "unanimous consent" is to be sought, make thirty-five folio volumes! The uncertainty of these catalogues of the Fathers, and the immense collections of their works in Greek and Latin, make the "unanimous consent" sufficiently difficult to secure.

§ 2. The Unanimous Consent.

517

The "unanimous consent!" We should laugh at it as a piece of grim irony, were it not for the serious issues involved. There is no end to patristic contradictions: they agree in nothing but the existence of God, if in that. Milton admits that there are good things in the Fathers, enough to silence Anglican and Romish *patrolaters*; yet, says he, in his rather savage way, "Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the Fathers."

It seems useless to give instances of their contradictions:

contradictions of Scripture, of philosophy, of history, of one another, and sometimes, as in the case of Tertullian and Augustin, each of himself. Tertullian turned Montanist and advanced the most crazy notions, and Augustin published a book of Retractations. Look at the frivolities of Barnabas, the puerile visions of Hermas, the phoenix of Clement, the prelatical driveling of Ignatius (most of which is probably interpolated, but indistinguishable from the genuine), the millennial twaddle of Papias, which came nearer than any thing else for a time to getting the unanimous consent in question; the Judaico-Greek philosophy of Justin, and his rabbinical interpretation of Gen. vi. 3, making the sons of God that married the beautiful daughters of men veritable angels attracted from heaven by woman's charms! Look at the *quasi* antipedobaptism of Tertullian, and his rant about the efficacy of trine immersion, salt, milk, honey, etc, in baptism: in which latter he had plenty to agree with him. Look at the fanaticism of Origen in his self-mutilation on account of a mistaken exegesis of Matt. xix. 12, and at his errors on the Trinity, on the Atonement, and on the Restoration of the damned, including the devil himself: even Romanists have to exclude him from the list. Many of the Fathers taught that the price of man's redemption was paid to the devil! Then see their unscriptural reverence for relics, their multiplication of rites and ceremonies, their laudation of celibacy, their magnifying of prelacy (ending in the supremacy of the pope), and their overweening regard for Mary (ending in Mariolatry. In short, nearly all the superstitions and heresies of Rome have their germs in the waitings of the Fathers: hence the estimate in which they are held by Romanists

and Romanizers. But what infatuated folly to talk about their "unanimous consent," when they agreed in scarcely any thing. The Ante-Nicene Fathers differed widely in their views concerning the Trinity and the person and work of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Not only Sabellius, Arius, and others that are arbitrarily excluded from the patristic catalogues, because reputed heretics, but others reputed orthodox, who differed but little, if any, from those heretics, are guilty of these contradictions. The first four Councils happily settled those questions, and there was a general, though not unanimous, consent among the Catholics in regard to them. But how soon were the Eastern Fathers arrayed against the Western on

the *Filioque*, and a schism occasioned which has not been healed to this day! Why should Pelagius and Celestius be doomed as heretics, and Augustin and his followers be canonized as saints and great doctors of the Church? Was not Pelagius as wise and virtuous and orthodox as Augustin? He was a Libertarian, as were all the Fathers before him, as well as the Apostles and Evangelists—though he pushed his principles to an erroneous extreme—but he was far more rational, and not less Scriptural, than his irate opponent, who introduced into the Church the heresy of absolute predestination, which has proved a bone of contention in every age down to the present. Besides this, one can scarcely light upon a page in Augustin, who is pompously styled the Prince of the Fathers, without finding puerility, superstition, or error in some of its forms. But we weary of this unpleasant theme. Those who wish to pursue it further must study the comparatively new science of patristics; and they will then learn what is the "Right Use of the Fathers," to borrow the title of Daille's classical work on that subject. They will find that the Fathers must be, as Warburton says, "degraded from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence—in which too they are not to speak, like Irish evidence, in every cause where they are wanted, but only to such matters as are agreed to be within their knowledge." That is precisely the use we have made of them. Archbishop Trench may occasionally find a good exegetical note on passages of Scripture in their writings; but it betrays insanity to go to the Fathers for the right interpretation of Holy Scripture. Coleridge uttered no "exaggeration," as some suggest, when he said of the great divines of the Reformation, that "the least of them

was not inferior to Augustin, and worth a brigade of the Cyprians, Firmilians, and the like." The great fault we find with Luther and Calvin, for example, was their too high regard for Augustin, leading them into the adoption of his predestinarian errors, the damnation of non-elect infants, inamissible grace, and the like. But it is an insult to a man's common sense to compare Calvin as an interpreter of Scripture with Augustin. How one would be startled to find in Calvin such a note as this, that all the hairs of our head will be raised in the resurrection, and be incorporated into our glorified bodies, because Christ addressed this proverbial saying to his apostles, "Not a hair of your heads shall perish!" Yet this sapient exegesis (with many more equally wise and witty) is found in

Augustin's "City of God" (Book XXII. 19), and is indorsed in the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

So much for the unanimous consent of the Fathers. So much for the famous rule of Vincentius (A.D. 450), that we are to believe no more, no less, than has been believed always, and everywhere, and among all—*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*

IV. The Decisions of Councils.

The Decisions of Councils constitute the next great addition to the Rule of Faith, as held by Romanists.

§ 1. What Ecclesiastical Synods are Councils?

Here again we encounter a difficulty. What synods of the Church are to be recognized as councils? All churches in every age have had gatherings of this sort; but all of these cannot be meant. Then the Greek and Latin Churches have had a vast number of assemblies called "Provincial Councils;" they cannot be included. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. says, "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and, likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church."

So then General Councils are meant. But what councils that bear the name of general are to be admitted into the sacred number of the infallible and authoritative?

520

The Church of England, in the "Homily Against the Peril of Idolatry," says, "These six councils were allowed and received of all men:" Nice, A.D. 325; First Constantinople, 381; Ephesus, 431; Chalcedon, 451; Second Constantinople, 553; Third Constantinople, 680. The Greeks and Latins alike hold to these Councils; though by adding the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.) they make seven instead of six. Elliott says, "Eighteen General Councils are enumerated by Romanists, from the first Nicene to the Tridentine, rejecting those of

Constance and Basel, and several others." McClintock and Strong say, "The Roman Catholics added twelve to the number, making nineteen." They then give the list extending from the Second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, which established image worship, to the Council of Trent, 1545–1563. But then in this list are the Councils of Constance (A.D. 1414–1418, which asserted the superiority of a General Council to the Pope), and that of Basel (A.D. 1431, which attempted to reform the Church), whose acts are regarded by papists as null and void. To these General Councils, improperly so called, because only Romanists were represented in them, must be added the Council of the Vatican, A.D. 1870, which declared the infallibility of the Pope. It is simply impossible to tell, even upon Roman Catholic grounds, what are General Councils.[4]

§ 2. The Authority of the Roman Church and Her Councils.

521

And what authority has the Romish Church to gather together an assembly of prelates, whether by the order of the Emperor or of the Pope, or of both united, and call it a General Council, when no other part of Christendom is invited or allowed to have a place in the body? And what blasphemy to say that the acts of such gatherings as the most of these were were inspired by the Holy Ghost! The acts of Trent were inspired by Rome: hence it was wittily said that the Holy Ghost was sent in a portmanteau from Rome to Trent. Did the Holy Ghost inspire the Tridentine doctors to set forth all those superstitious and unscriptural *credenda* and *agenda* contained in the decrees and canons and catechism of the Council of Trent? Did the Holy Ghost inspire the General Council of Lyons, A.D. 1245, to order the Crusades? Did the Holy Ghost inspire the Fourth Council of Lateran to confirm the absurd and impious dogma of Transubstantiation? Did the Holy Ghost inspire the Second Council of Nice to break the Second Commandment by ordering the worship of images—against which Charlemagne convened a counter Council at Frankfort, A.D. 794? But there might be no end to such questions, which furnish their own answers. The Twenty-first Article of the Anglican Church well says, bating the first sentence, and the mildness of the rest:

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and word of God,

522

they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.[5]

V. The Bulls of Popes.

The Bulls of Popes constitute another Romish addition to the Rule of Faith.

Bulls are papal letters, having a seal of lead, bearing the

523

name and title of the Pope who issues them. They are called *bulls* from the Latin *bulla*, low Latin for a pendent metallic seal. This seal has on one side the heads of Peter and Paul. Bulls are issued for all purposes in the interest of the Roman Church: the suppression of so-called heresy and schism, as the celebrated bull against Quesnel, the famous *Unigenitus*; the bull against Luther, *Exsurge Domine*; and, save the mark! that for the abolition of the order of Jesuits! A *Bullarium* is a collection of papal bulls. The *Bullarium Romanum Magnum* is a collection from the time of Leo the Great, begun in 1586 by Cherubini and continued by others. The *Bullarium Magnum* of Maynardus—nineteen volumes folio—contains the bulls from Leo the Great to Benedict XIV. The Bullarium of Cocquelines contains fourteen folio volumes. A continuation of these collections is *Benedicti XIV. Bullarium*, Mechlin, thirteen volumes. Barberi's continuation, comprising the bulls of Clement XIII. and following Popes, extending to 1821, makes fifteen folio volumes. A new *Bullarium*, comprising all the bulls from Leo the Great to the present Pope, has been begun by Tomassetti; the first volume was issued at Turin in 1857. The bull *In Coena Domini* is not in the *Bullarium Magnum* of Luxemburg. That of Innocent VIII. against the Waldenses, and that of Sixtus V. are in no *Bullarium*. Rome wants to suppress them. The bulls of Pius IX., establishing as dogmas the immaculate conception of Mary and the infallibility of the Pope, are not yet, of course, in any *Bullarium*. According to the development

theory of Rome, there is no end to the addition of dogmas to the Creed. Pius IV. added twelve new articles, sanctioned by the Council of Trent, to the Apostles' Creed, and Pius IX. added two more; and being declared infallible he could develop as many more as he pleased, and so can his successor, Leo XIII. This is a beautiful rule of faith, indeed! Bellarmin says: "The pontiff cannot err by a judicial error, that is, when he judges and defines a question of faith, or in decrees pertaining to morals." He can do any thing he pleases *ex cathedra*, and that, according to some, means every thing, and according to others nothing at all! And yet every Christian is bound to respect the *Bullarium* as he respects the Bible!

VI. The Dicta of the Priests.

524

But, to sum it all up, the great addition to the rule of faith consists in the *dicta* of the priests.

Romanists cannot but see that by no other subterfuge can they set forth the practicableness of their rule of faith. "Their rule," says Elliott, "in addition to the Scriptures, comprises about one hundred and thirty-five volumes folio, made up of the following works: the bulls of Popes are at least eight volumes folio"—forty-seven folio volumes have been issued—"the decretals, ten volumes folio; the acts of Councils, thirty-one volumes folio; the *Acta Sanctorum*, fifty-one volumes folio. Add to these at least thirty-five volumes of Greek and Latin Fathers, in which is to be found that part of the rule called the unanimous consent; add to these one hundred and thirty-five volumes folio of unread and unexamined materials, the unlimited mass of unwritten traditions which have floated down from the commencement of the Christian era to the present time in oral communication, or, in other words, by mere *hearsay* transmission—all these cumbrous additions made to the Holy Scriptures constitute the Roman Catholic rule."

What can the common people know about such a rule? Nothing at all. But Dr. Milner says: "You will not need to spend your life in studying the Sacred Scriptures—you will only have to learn what the Church teaches upon the several articles of her faith, in order to know with certainty what God revealed concerning them." He delivers this sophism:

Most likely the Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the Church from his parish priest; but then he knows that the doctrine of this priest must be conformable to that of his bishop. He knows also that the doctrine of the bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other bishops and the pope, and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors up to the apostles themselves.

There you have the collier's faith with a witness: "I believe whatever the Church believes, the Church believes what I believe—and the Church and I believe alike!" Does not every one see that after all the poor, besotted papist is utterly denied the right of private judgment, except as he must exercise it in choosing the keeper of his faith and his conscience, according to the fiftieth reason of the Duke of Brunswick for abjuring Protestantism for popery: He asked the Protestant ministers

525

if they would hold him harmless on the day of judgment; they, of course, said they would not. He then asked the priests, and they said they would. So he turned papist, and shifted the responsibility of his belief upon his ecclesiastical sponsors. Now consider the *pabulum* with which Romish priests feed their flocks; examine their books of devotion, their catechisms and other manuals; listen to their expositions of Scripture and explanations of questions referring to faith and morals, and you will see the advantage derived from the addition of the Apocrypha, Tradition, Writings of Fathers, Decrees of Councils, Bulls of Popes, and Dicta of Priests, to the divinely authenticated, infallible, exclusive standard of faith and practice.

Conclusion.

§ 1. Errors of the Anglicans.

It is to be regretted that many divines of the Anglican Church have used unguarded expressions in reference to the authority of the Fathers and Tradition. We do not now refer to those who are called Tractarians, Puseyites, or Ritualists, as they are Romanists, scarcely in disguise. They ought to go to their own place: Rome. But we allude to the old divines, chiefly those of the High-church

school. Bishop Browne in section iii. of his learned Exposition of the Sixth Article, gives us the names of many of them and their unguarded views, which he indorses. He says:

> Tradition is of two kinds, Hermeneutical and Ecclesiastical. Hermeneutical Tradition "tends to explain and interpret the Scriptures." Ecclesiastical Tradition relates to discipline and ceremonial. As the New Testament gives no precise form of Church polity and worship, we must look to the Fathers for it, as they must have known what the apostles ordered; and a knowledge of this and conformity to it is "essential for the regulating and governing of a Church."

But surely one can ascertain what was the mind of the Apostles in the premises a great deal more readily by consulting their Acts and Epistles than by plunging into that mass of contradictory matter, the writings of the Fathers. It is observable too that those Fathers, called Apostolic, who lived nearest the times of the Apostles say far less on these subjects than their successors. Must we conclude that their successors knew what they believed and practiced, as they knew what was believed and practiced by the Apostles? But we have already seen to what dangerous lengths this principle will lead us.

526

So of Hermeneutical Tradition. We have shown that the immediate successors of the Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, and those who came next to them, are among the worst interpreters of Scripture that the world ever saw. Must I go to Papias for an exposition of the Apocalypse? Must I go to Irenaeus for an exposition of the Gospel of John? Must I go to Tertullian to learn what the apostles taught about baptism? or to Ignatius (interpolated or not) to learn what they taught about bishops, priests, and deacons? Must I consult Augustin for an infallible interpretation of Paul's Epistle to the Romans? The Convocation of 1571 may have meant well when they passed the Thirty-nine Articles and enacted a Code of Canons, in one of which they say:

> In the first place, let preachers take heed that they deliver nothing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but that which is agreeable to the Old and New Testament, and such as the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected therefrom.

And so the compilers of the Prayer Book say in their preface: "It is evident to all men reading Holy Scripture *and ancient authors* that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of

ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." So Cranmer: "I also grant that every exposition of the Scripture, wherinsoever the old, holy, and true Church did agree, is necessary to be believed; but our controversy here" (with the papists) "is, whether any thing ought to be believed of necessity without the Scripture." So Ridley:

> In that the Church of Christ is in doubt, I use herein the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow; who, giving precepts how the Catholic Church may be in all schisms and heresies known, writeth in this manner: "When," saith he, "one part is corrupted with heresies, then prefer the whole world before that one part; but if the greatest part be affected, then prefer antiquity."

What vagueness is here! What a jumble of inconsistencies and contradictions! One would think that the Fathers were a set of wise and learned men—all saintly, of course—who held a council, in which, they laid down in plain Greek or Latin, in clear, unmistakable, authoritative terms, the meaning of every jot and tittle in the Holy Scriptures; framed a Church polity, with as much precision as the form and style of the tabernacle shown to Moses on the mount; and formed a catechism like that of

Trent, prescribing what must be believed and what must be rejected on pain of eternal damnation!

We have shown that the reverse of all this is the fact. Why, not even the Apostles' Creed, so-called, can claim such a genesis. The preface to the Tridentine Catechism, indeed, says the Twelve Apostles composed this Creed. And yet this monstrous fable, rejected by Anglicans, is set forth as true history in the writings of these same Fathers, to whom forsooth we are to look not for the rule of faith, indeed, but for its only authoritative and unerring, if not infallible, interpretation! If we permit the Anglican to let the camel get his head in thus far, the Romanist will remain perfectly easy, being sure that his whole body will soon follow.

We thankfully accept all that is good in the works of the Fathers—and there is a great deal of good in them, especially in Jerome and Chrysostom; we are glad to see in them so important witnesses and conservators of the faith once delivered to the saints; and we glorify the grace of God which enabled so many to seal their testimony with their blood: but here we stop. We advise those who are set for the defense of the gospel to study patristics, but to

beware of patrolatry and patrolaters.

§ 2. Attributes or Marks of the Bible.

In our dissertations on this subject we have comprehended all the points embraced in what the theologians of the sixteenth century called *Affectiones Scripturae*. These attributes of the Bible are of two classes:

I. Primary Attributes.

1. *Intelligibleness.* Romanists and infidels allege that the Bible is unintelligible: at least, as papists say, without the exposition of the Church. Now we assert that "the Holy Scriptures are so written," as Knapp says, "that the first readers, for whom they were specially designed, could understand the greater part of them without the necessity of laborious interpretation, and that even we can obtain from them a clear acquaintance with those doctrines of religion which are essential to our improvement, comfort, and salvation." This is compatible with the obvious fact that some of the inspired writings are obscure and indeed were not fully understood by the writers themselves; that some require patient and prayerful research, and are the more valuable

on that account; and that all of them require translation into the various languages of the world that every one may read them in his own tongue in which he was born.
2. *Efficacy.* If the language is intelligible, the principles, precepts, and promises which it makes known, when applied by the inspiring Spirit, never fail to prove the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth.
3. *Infallibility.* This, as we have shown, is compatible with various readings and the like: we have the strongest assurance that the inspired writers were divinely

preserved from all error.

4. *Authority.* Hence follows their authority.

    1. *Auctoritas normativa vel canonica.* This extends to every thing, whether we can comprehend it or not. *Vox Scripturae, vox Dei.* Christ taught many things which his hearers could not fully comprehend; but by his miracles he established his claims as a teacher; and as Pliny the younger said of a philosopher: *Tua mihi auctoritas pro ratione sufficit.*
    2. *Auctoritas judicialis.* This is the judge which ends the strife, settling all controversies. But how carefully should we interpret these infallible and authoritative decisions.

5. *Sufficiency.* We have fully shown that the additions to this rule of faith are alike impious and impertinent.

II. Secondary Attributes.

1. *Necessity.* We have fully shown that the revealed word of God is indispensable: no powers of reason or intuition, no imaginary "inward light," no outward tradition, nothing whatever can supersede the Holy Scriptures.
2. *Integrity.* We have seen too that no part essential to the sacred canon has been lost.
3. *Purity.* The uncorrupted preservation of the sacred text is due to a special providence, amounting well-nigh to miracle.
4. *Freedom.* Some add freedom: *Legendi omnibus concessa licentia*—the privilege of all of every condition, and of both sexes, to read the word of God. No candid reader of the Holy Scriptures, or indeed of the works of the Fathers, can deny that they were designed for the constant and diligent perusal of all people upon the face of the earth.

§ 3. Summary and Conclusion.

In our discussion of this Fifth Article of our Confession (Sixth of the Anglican), we have taken a wide range, as it is of the last

importance, to show that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation;" and also to show that the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, as contained in our Bibles, alone have that distinction.

We have seen that the sacred writings are pertinent—they treat on the subject of salvation; that they are genuine—they were written by those whose names they bear; that they are authentic—they are what they profess to be, divine oracles; and we have shown that there are strong presumptions, pregnant proofs, and overwhelming demonstrations of their authenticity, coping with the objections of infidels of every type, and, we trust, setting them aside by incontrovertible argument. And lastly, we have shown their exhaustive character: they contain all things necessary to salvation, so that, as a rule of faith, they are perfect, admitting of no subtraction by so-called rationalists and others, and of no addition by Romanists or any others, under whatever disguise or from whatever motive.

"The Bible, the Bible, alone," as Chillingworth says, "is the religion of Protestants." "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

---

1. For a history of the word Canon, see Westcott on the Canon of the New Testament, Appendix *A*, pp. 504–511. The Alexandrian grammarians called the body of classic Greek authors ὁ κανών, *i. e.*, the standard of linguistic purity. In connection with the Scriptures, the adjective (κανονικός) and the verb (κανονίζω) were first used, occurring in Origen. "The original meaning of the whole class of words, *canonical, canonize, canon*," says Westcott, "in reference to the Scriptures is necessarily to be sought in that of the word first used. But κανονικός, like κανών, was employed both in an active and in a passive sense. Letters which contained rules, and letters

composed according to rule, were alike called canonical; and so the name may have been given to the apostolic writings either as containing the standard of doctrine or as ratified by the decision of the Church. Popular opinion favors the first interpretation: the prevalent usage of the word, however, is decidedly in favor of the second. Thus the Latin equivalent of κανονικός, *regularis*, points to a passive sense. Ecclesiastics again of every grade were called *canonici*, as bound by a common rule; and in later times we commonly read of canonical obedience, a canonical allowance, and canonical hours of prayer." The earliest uses of the verb and noun as applied to the Scriptures also appear to be with the passive meaning. (See Westcott.) The noun occurs in two passages of St. Paul's Epistles, Gal. vi. 16 and 2 Cor. x. 13–16.—T.↩

2. There is a curious blunder in the preface to Cranmer's Bible, where it is said that certain books were called *Hagiographa*, "because they were wont to be read, not openly and in common, but as it were in secret and apart." The passage was taken from the preface to the Bible of "Thomas Matthewe," 1537, in which the word "Apocrypha" is found. In Cranmer's Bible, which was a revision of "Matthewe's" (so-called, for the name is fictitious), the word *Hagiographa* was printed, and the interpretation which referred to the Apocrypha was allowed to remain! (See *Westminster Review* for July, 1876, p. 107.)↩
3. And yet it is evident the attitude of the Church toward the Scriptures is fundamentally different in the Roman Catholic and the Protestant systems. In the former the Church is an authoritative and infallible judge, determining and publishing through its tribunals what is Scripture. Protestantism, on the other hand, proves the genuineness and trustworthiness of the Bible as a whole, and of its several documents, by the ordinary canons of diplomatic and literary criticism and the rules of historical evidence, such as are employed with respect to classical or other ancient literature. Original, general, and uninterrupted acceptance in a religious community, called the Church, may be, and doubtless is, the decisive element in this historical proof; but the Church is not in this case a divinely commissioned and endowed authority to determine what is and what is not Scripture.—T.↩
4. There has, indeed, been much dispute in the Roman Church about the ecumenical character of certain councils. According to Hefele, the great Roman Catholic historian of the councils, the seventeen following are universally recognized without dispute by all Roman theologians and ecclesiastical authorities. Of these, the doctrinal decisions of the first four are received throughout the Latin, Greek, and Protestant communions, thus constituting the test of fundamental orthodoxy for Christendom. The validity of the first

eight is equally acknowledged in the Latin and Greek Churches: they were held, in genera), under imperial presidency, protection, and confirmation. This is Hefele's list:

1. I. Nicaea, 325
2. I. Constantinople, 381
3. Ephesus, 431
4. Chalcedon, 451
5. II. Constantinople, 553
6. III. Constantinople, 680
7. II. Nicaea, 787
8. IV. Constantinople, 869
9. I. Lateran, 1123
10. II. Lateran, 1139
11. III. Lateran, 1179
12. IV. Lateran, 1215
13. I. Lyons, 1245
14. II. Lyons, 1274
15. Florence, 1439
16. Trent, 1545–1563
17. Vatican, 1870

Hefele rejects the ecumenical claims of these four synods:

1. Sardica, 343–344
2. Trullo, 692
3. Pisa, 1409
4. V. Lateran, 1512–1517

After careful and full discussion of all the extant evidence, he adds to the seventeen undisputed councils these three, of whose ecumenical character he is satisfied, some sessions of the last two being excepted because of informality:

1. Vienne, 1311
2. Constance, 1414–1418
3. Basle, 1431–1442

Pisa, Constance, and Basle are the three great reformatory councils of the fifteenth century. They represent the effort of the Roman Church at self-reformation. The better elements in the Latin Church saw and urged the necessity for a thorough-going reform of the Church "in head and members." The best apology for the Reformation is the history of Rome during the fifteenth century: here we need not the eloquence of special pleading, only a plain narrative of the facts. Had the fifteenth-century councils established the principles they represented and succeeded in the work they undertook, incorporating great measures of reform in the

constitution of the Church, as at times seemed almost certain, the work of the Reformation might have been anticipated, and the history of Christianity and of the world in modern times cast in essentially different molds. But the Latin Church, in three successive, and by no means insignificant efforts, at Pisa, Constance, and Basle, showed itself incapable of accomplishing the great task, acknowledged and self-imposed. Hence the justification of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.—T.↩

5. Romanists hold that the right to convoke an ecumenical council rests exclusively with the Pope, and many attempt to prove that every council from the beginning was so assembled, though the more candid are content with asserting that, while the earlier councils were called together at the command of the emperors, this action was either suggested or, at least, approved by the bishop of Rome, meaning, of course, that without such suggestion or approval the council would be devoid of ecumenical character and authority. The truth is that the first eight councils were all assembled by imperial authority. The Church of England has deemed this fact of such importance that her theologians of the Reformation period framed the express article quoted above. All the subsequent councils have been convened directly by the popes; but history makes plain the long interval (from 869 to 1123) which elapsed between the last exercise of this power by the emperor and its first exercise by the pope. The presidency of the councils is also, from the Roman stand-point, a question of the first importance. But here again a great deal of ingenuity is required to establish the universality of papal presidency, in person or by legates. Constantine presided in the Council of Nicaea, and imperial protection, supervision, and formal presidency distinguish almost all of the first eight councils. The Nicene Creed was formally confirmed by Constantine; the second ecumenical council expressly asked for the confirmation of Theodosius the Great; Theodosius II. practically confirmed the third by enforcing its principal decision; the Emperor Marcion in four edicts consented to the doctrinal decisions of the Council of Chalcedon; the fifth council merely carried out the purposes of Justinian; Constantine Pogonatus confirmed the decrees of the sixth council both by his signature and by edict; at the last session of the seventh council the Empress Irene and her son signed all the decrees, thus giving them imperial sanction; and Basil the Macedonian with his sons signed the decrees of the eighth council, and in 870 published an edict of approval. Hefele concedes: “The papal confirmation of *all* these eight first ecumenical councils is not so clear and distinct.” Undoubtedly so, for in the earlier councils papal confirmation was a matter of comparatively little importance,

especially in contrast with the necessity for imperial sanction and execution. The long-debated question about the relative superiority of Pope and Council was decided in favor of Councils, by the rejected Council of Pisa, 1409, which was called by the two colleges of cardinals of rival popes in common session at Leghorn, without the sanction of pope or emperor, and finally in favor of the Pope by the Council of the Vatican, 1870.—T.↩

Part II.

Article VI.
Of the Old Testament.

530

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God, by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity to be received in any Commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

Introduction.

This Article is formed out of the Sixth and the Nineteenth Articles of the Confession of 1552. The Sixth reads thus:

The Old Testament is not to be put away, as though it were contrary to the New, but to be kept still; for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind only by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

The Nineteenth reads as follows:

The Law, which was given of God by Moses, although it bind not Christian men, as concerning the ceremonies and rites of the same, neither is it required that the civil precepts and orders of it should be received in any common weal, yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and loose from the obedience of those commandments which are called moral; wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto, who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit of whom (they say) they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be more evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.

It does not appear that much was gained by blending these two articles into one: the several sections, however, which our analysis

affords may be discussed separately.

Chapter I. Harmony of the Old and New Testaments.

531
The first section states that “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.”

§ 1. Opposed to Dualistic Errors.

This part opposes the impious and absurd notion of the Gnostics that the Demiurge, or Creator of the world, was not the Supreme God; but an inferior and evil being who was the founder of the Jewish dispensation. One of their prime leaders, Marcion, it is stated, wrote a book called *Antitheses*, in which he arrayed passages from the Old Testament against passages from the New, to show that they disagreed, and that the former could not proceed from the Supreme Being, as did the latter. Tertullian wrote against this insanity. The Valentinians made themselves conspicuous in advocating the delusion.

The Manichees, who believed in Dualism, in like manner repudiated the Old Testament, as coming from the Principle of Darkness. The Cathari and other mediaeval sects are charged with this Manichean heresy, as are some of the fanatical sects that arose at the time of the Reformation, as the Anabaptists and Antinomians, to whom, it is thought, the framers of the Article had special reference. In this matter the Anabaptists appear to be imitated by some of the sect called Campbellite Baptists, who, if they do not repudiate the Old Testament as contrary to the New, profess but little regard for it.

§ 2. The Old Testament Fully Indorsed in the New.

Now, it is not necessary to go into any lengthened discussion of this subject, as in Article V., “Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation,” we established the divine authority of the

Old Testament as well as of the New. Indeed, the Old Testament looks forward to the New as its complement; and the New looks backward to the Old as its necessary introduction.

532

Taken apart—the one divided from the other—there would be no pertinency in either. The short and easy method of dealing with this subject, and precluding any controversy on it, with those who admit the inspiration of the New Testament, is to show that the New Testament everywhere indorses the Old. The references to Christ in the Old Testament, as verified in the New, are so numerous that it would fill a volume to transcribe them.

Jesus Christ constantly appealed to the Old Testament in support of his claims. Thus he said to the Jews, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." (John v. 46; *cf.* John viii. 56.) And addressing his disciples after his resurrection he said unto them, "These are the truths which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me." (Luke xxiv. 44; *cf.* verses 25–27, 45–47.) Instead of opposing the Old Testament, he confirmed it by his own divine authority. In his Sermon on the Mount he says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (Matt. v. 17.)

To the same effect is the constant teaching of the apostles. Thus Peter says, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) So Paul: "They that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." (Acts xiii. 27.) So at Thessalonica, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures [the O. T.], opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ." (Acts xvii. 1–3.) So to the Romans he says: "For even Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me. For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." (Rom. xv. 3, 4; *cf.* xvi. 25–27.) Writing to Timothy he says: "And that from a child

thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which

533

is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 15–17.)

But it is useless to multiply citations. Christ and the apostles made the Old Testament their great text-book, by which they confirmed all their teachings. It is absurd to recognize the New Testament as inspired, and to reject the Old as contrary to it. There is the most perfect agreement between them.

§ 3. Christ in the Old Testament.

It is said of Bishop Hall that he found Christ everywhere in the Old Testament, and of Grotius that he found him nowhere in the Old Testament. This is, of course, an exaggeration. Doubtless those eminent men did err in these respects. But we are in no danger of erring if we find Christ wherever he himself and his apostles found him.

They found him in the seed of the woman that should bruise the serpent's head (Gen. iii. 15; Gal. iv. 4, 5; Rom. xvi. 20); in the seed of Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18; Acts iii. 25; Gal. iii. 8, 16); in the brazen serpent (Num. xxi. 9; John iii. 14, 15); in the prophet like unto Moses (Deut. xviii. 13; Acts iii. 22, 23; vii. 37); in the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12; John xix. 36; 1 Cor. v. 7; John i. 29, 36); in the scape-goat and slain-goat and other sacrifices on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix.); and in the other sacrifices of the Ceremonial Institute: Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, *passim*. See also, Isa. liii.; Matt. viii. 17; Acts viii. 32–35; Mark xv. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 21–25. He is the root and the offspring of David, the Messianic king on the throne of David (Ps. ii.; cx.; Isa. ix. 6, 7; xi.; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Dan. ix. 24–27; Luke i. 31–33; Rom. xv. 12; Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16). He is a priest upon his throne: the true Melchizedek, uniting in himself the regal and the sacerdotal offices (Gen. xiv. 18; Ps. cx.; Zech. vi. 12, 13; Heb. v.–vii.).

These are samples of Messianic passages in the Old Testament

identified and fulfilled in the New. Cowper has a beautiful hymn, entitled, “The Old Testament Gospel,” which strikingly illustrates the subject, beginning:

Israel in ancient days.

Chapter II. Eternal Life Revealed in the Old Testament.

534

The second section of this article states: “Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.” Truly such are not to he heard. It is astonishing that any, especially learned divines, should assert that the Old Testament saints had no knowledge of a future state.

§ 1. Warburton’s “Divine Legation of Moses.”

One of the most learned, and at the same time the most paradoxical, works ever written is Bishop Warburton’s “Divine Legation of Moses.” Warburton was an arrogant writer, unscrupulous in his assertions, and utterly impatient of contradiction. His great work is an attempt to show that Moses must have been divinely commissioned or he could not have governed the Israelites as he did, seeing that he acted contrary to all other ancient legislators, who called to their aid the sanctions of future retribution: this, he says, Moses studiously avoided. He admits that other nations believed in a future state, and that the Jews themselves did so after the captivity, but affirms that the earlier Jews had no knowledge of it. Nearly the whole tribe of Rationalists adopt the same view. They contend that a future state was not known during the Patriarchal age, or during the Jewish dispensation till toward its close.

§ 2. Moses’s Design in the Composition of Genesis.

How can we account for this gross error? We have reflected on it a great deal, and suppose it originated in the fact that it was not the design of Moses to detail the faith, worship, and morals of the Patriarchal dispensation, as he was not writing for those who lived in that age. The Patriarchal dispensation had passed away when he wrote the book of Genesis. That book, at the lowest chronology,

covers over two thousand three hundred and sixty-nine years, and it is absurd to suppose that Moses could have designed to detail the faith, worship, and

morals of the Patriarchs in the short space of that history. His design was simply to give a concise account of the creation and fall of man, the general deluge, the call of Abram, and the covenant with him and his seed, with brief biographical notes of distinguished persons, notices of remarkable events, chronologies, and the like. No wonder that there are in the book of Genesis no dogmatic statements concerning a future state, or indeed any other theological points.

§ 3. Moses's Design in the Other Books of the Pentateuch.

Then as to the other books of the Pentateuch: it is clear that Moses intended to give the *origines* of the Israelitish nation, with the laws of the theocracy under which the peculiar people were placed. The sanctions of these theocratic laws were of course temporal rewards and punishments; and one might almost as well look into the Constitution and laws of the United States for future rewards and punishments as into the Mosaic code.

The truth is, the Pentateuch, and indeed all the other books of the Old Testament, are written just as one would expect them to be written, for a people who were familiar with the doctrine of a future state as one of the elementary principles of religion.

§ 4. The Book of Job.

It is said indeed that the book of Job contains the history of a non-Israelitish people, who did not live under a theocracy, and yet they recognized providential dispensations in this world as the sanctions of the divine government. So they did—and such was the case. Though they did not live under a theocracy, yet they were subject to extraordinary and miraculous providences, such as do not obtain in our age: and this led Job and his friends to deduce inferences therefrom which God himself pronounced to be false. But they did not ignore the doctrine of a future state of rewards and

punishments. Though they were not Israelites, yet they were descendants of Abraham and Isaac, and could not be ignorant of the traditions of their pious ancestors. They knew very well that "God created man to be an image of his own immortality" and that though Adam fell from it yet he was restored to it in the promised and prospective redemption by the woman's Seed. They knew very well that "Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him."

(Gen. v. 24.) They must have understood this as the Son of Sirach understood it: "Enoch pleased the Lord, and was translated" (Ecclus. xliv. 16); and as Paul understood it: "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." (Heb. xi. 5.) Whither was he translated? Into the viewless winds there to be lost, as to his personal identity, forever? Nay; for "God took him." And we know where God is: in the eternal heaven. The translation of Enoch was doubtless designed to confirm the faith of the patriarchs in a future state. Indeed, in common with the translation of Elijah under the Jewish dispensation, "when the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven" (2 Kings ii.), as a confirming sign to that generation; and the ascension of Christ under our dispensation, who went up to heaven in sight of his disciples, the translation of Enoch very materially confirms our faith in an unseen world and a future state. Job and his friends were not ignorant of this; and, though they expected piety to be rewarded and sin to be punished in this life, yet this did not interfere with their faith in future retributions. Warburton contends that Job denies that there is a future state in Job vii.; xiv. "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more." "So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." "If a man die, shall he live again?" But a thousand expressions of this tenor prove nothing. They only affirm that death closes forever our existence upon the earth. They say nothing about what shall occur when "the heavens shall pass away, and the earth shall be burnt up." (2 Pet. iii.) Peter looked for "a new heaven and a new earth;" and so it would seem did Job also: for he exclaims, "O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a

set time, and remember me. If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." Bear in mind, too, that after he had given up all hope of bettering his fortunes in this world, or continuing much longer in it, he utters this memorable

exclamation: "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." (Job xix. 23–27.) After all the attempts to make this exultant outburst refer to future temporal prosperity—which Job indeed realized, but which he could not have foreseen—the compilers of the Liturgy were fully justified in putting it into the Burial Service, as referring to the resurrection from the dead and the life of the world to come. With such a hope as that Job might well say, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." (Job xiii. 15.)

§ 5. The Psalms.

In Psalm xvi. 8–11, according to Peter and Paul, David predicts the resurrection of Christ, concluding thus: "Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fullness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." And yet David knew nothing of a future state!

The frequent references to heaven, as the abode of God and the angels, in the Psalter and elsewhere, indicates a familiarity with this subject, which precludes the notion that the "fathers" had no knowledge of a future state. Thus Asaph says: "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever." (Ps. lxiii. 24–26; *cf.* Ps. ciii. 19, 20.)

The prophets were so familiar with the doctrine of a future state that they make use of the resurrection from the dead as a metaphor to set forth the revival of the people of Israel from their national decay. “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.” (Isa. xxvi. 19.) *Cf.* xxv. 8: “He will swallow up death in victory.” So Ezekiel’s vision of the resurrection of

the dry bones. (Ezek. xxxvii.) So Dan. xii. 2, 3: “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” This passage may indeed refer to the literal resurrection from the dead, with special reference to the Antiochean persecution in which so many were slain for the word of God and the testimony which they held. They should rise to glory, but others who abandoned their religion to save their lives should rise to shame. This may be illustrated by the account of the seven Maccabean martyrs and their heroic mother, in 2 Macc. vii. Thus one of them, “when he was at the last gasp,” said to the enraged monarch, “Thou like a fury takest us out of this present life, but the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life.” So “the fourth when he was ready to die” said thus: “It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God, to be raised up again by him: as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life.” When the seventh and youngest was persuaded by the king to “turn from the laws of his fathers,” and was promised honor and emolument if he would do so, his heroic mother adjured him to turn a deaf ear to the temptation: “Fear not this tormentor, but, being worthy of thy brethren, take thy death, that I may receive thee again.” The young martyr, turning to the king, defied him to do his worst, and said, “For our brethren who now have suffered a short pain, are dead under God’s covenant of everlasting life; but thou through the judgment of God shalt receive just punishment for thy pride.” Though this case may have been embellished by the uncertain author of this book, yet there is no reason to doubt its substantial truth; and it shows how firmly fixed was this doctrine in the minds

of the Jews of the Maccabean age.

The common opinion is very probable that Paul alluded to these Maccabean martyrs in Heb. xi. 35: “Others were tortured not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection.”

§ 7. Inconsistency of Those Who Receive the New Testament.

Those who, like Warburton, recognize the authenticity of the New Testament, act very inconsistently when they affirm that “the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.” It is marvelous how they can hold such an opinion in view of Luke xx. 27–38:

“Then came to him certain of the Sadducees (which deny that there is any resurrection), and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man’s brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him.” It is observable that Christ drew his proof from the Pentateuch, which was held in peculiar veneration by the Sadducees. It is observable too that, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus said unto them, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.” If they had “known” the latter, they would not have doubted the possibility of the resurrection (including the conscious existence of disembodied spirits, and their everlasting existence in union with their bodies after the resurrection); and if they had “known” the former they

would not have questioned its certainty. The patriarchs must have been living at the time specified by Moses (long after their death) or Jehovah could not have been their God, and their life in the separate state was and is an earnest of the resurrection of their bodies and their final and full and eternal glorification, both in body and soul, in the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

How can any one who believes in the inspiration of the apostles read Heb. xi. and still "feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises?" "By faith Abraham looked for a city which had foundations, whose builder and maker is God." "These all died in faith, not having received the promises"—that

is, the things promised—"but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had an opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." We shall not "darken" such inspired "counsel" by any "words" of ours. We can only repeat the expression of our amazement that any one can recognize the inspiration of the New Testament, and hold to the opinion in question. It is noteworthy that the Sadducees who said, "there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit," while "the Pharisees confessed both" (Acts xxiii. 8), were looked upon by the great body of the Jews as heretical innovators on the creed of Judaism; their views were denounced as novelties, unknown to "the old fathers." As a people the Jews always believed, and still believe, that their pious ancestors are in paradise, which they significantly styled "Abraham's bosom;" hence our Lord speaks of Lazarus as "carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom" (Luke xvi. 22), and says "that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. viii. 11). The evangelists also record the appearance of Moses and Elias in the scene of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1–13) in so familiar a style as to imply that no one questioned their being alive, though they might be astonished at their appearance on "the holy mount." The Targums and Talmuds are full of a future

state.

§ 8. Objections Founded on Old Testament Passages Refuted.

But after all these presumptions, proofs, and demonstrations of the point in question—viz., that the "old fathers" believed in a future state, some still object that there are passages in Job, the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah which assert that there is no *post-mortem* state of existence! This is, indeed, more than a paradox. In view of the foregoing we should be forced to the conclusion that either those passages are misinterpreted or they palpably contradict other and more explicit portions of the sacred

record. But there is no contradiction. Those passages are misinterpreted; and it is passing strange that any man of learning or critical acumen should fail to see their import. The passages in question simply assert that death is certain, and that when it takes place there is no redemption from it: no waking up from that sleep, *to live again in this world.* We who believe in the existence of the spirit in a disembodied state, and the resurrection of the body, use the same language. We speak of our deceased friends as the Scriptures speak of Enoch, when God took him, and of Rachel's children when they were slaughtered—"they are not"—meaning, as every child knows, not found any more upon the earth. We speak of their "sleeping the sleep that knows no waking," without dreaming that any one will charge us with the heresy of destructionism! Job says: "Man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep" (Job xiv.), a mournful descant on man's mortality. But all he means is that man's spirit at death ceases to live upon the earth, and his body sleeps in the grave: he does not intimate that he has no *post-mortem* existence, but the contrary, as we have seen. So when the Psalmist says, "In death there is no remembrance of thee," he explains it in the next clause, "In the grave, who shall give thee thanks?" (Ps. vi. 5). So in Ps. lxxxviii., which is entitled "A prayer containing a grievous complaint." It is a complaint of the Psalmist that he was just about to be separated by death from all the pleasant scenes and associations of life, which led him into a poetic description of the dreariness of the tomb: "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall

the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?"

This may have a pessimist sound, but we who believe firmly in immortality sometimes talk, at least sing, in the same doleful strain. Thus Dr. Watts:

> The pains, the groans, the dying strife,
> Fright our approaching souls away;
> And we shrink back again to life,
> Fond of our prison and our clay.

542

When Gray wrote his "Elegy in a Country Church-yard," he did not intend it for a Confession of Faith: it was a solemn descant upon the triumphs of death and the coldness and darkness of the silent grave: he never imagined that any one would infer from it that he did not believe in "the resurrection of the body, and the life of the world to come."

The Jews, as we have said, living under a theocracy, in which rewards and punishments were administered very largely in this life, naturally desired longevity, as a reward for obedience, as in Ex. xx. 12: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," and by no means indorsed the sentiment of the heathen poets, who did not, perhaps, believe it themselves: "Whom the gods love die young." The Psalmist no more referred to annihilation than did Hezekiah, in his mournful elegy, when he thought he was going to die: "I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave: I am deprived of the residue of my years. I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living: I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world." (Isa. xxxviii. 10, 11.) That is to say, he deplored the premature death which he thought he was about to experience, long before he had finished "the term of time" allotted to man, especially to those who, like himself, were the faithful servants of Jehovah. In answer to his prayer his life was miraculously prolonged; hence he says: "Thou hast in love to my soul"—that is, to himself as a living person—"delivered it from the pit of corruption"—that is, the grave—"for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back. For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot

celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." (Verses 17, 18.)

The famous passage in Ecclesiastes ix. 4–10, is of a similar character: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward"—*sachar*, hire, wages, advantage from the things of the world, no reference being made, of course, to the rewards of the future state—"for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they anymore a portion forever

in any thing that is done under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Is there? Does not a man's work cease at death? Do not we urge men to promptitude and diligence in the discharge of their duty by similar motives? The work of life is to be done while life lasts: it cannot be done in the grave. Had Jesus Christ no faith in a future state? and yet he uses about the same language as Solomon uses: "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work." (John ix. 4.) Indeed, one can hardly suppose that so wise a man as Solomon—for we insist that his name as the author of Ecclesiastes is no pseudonym—would contradict himself so palpably as to affirm in the ninth chapter that man is utterly extinct at death, and yet in the twelfth chapter say, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man"—or, this concerns all men—"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

It is hardly necessary to notice an objection drawn from 2 Timothy i. 10: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light, through the gospel"—or, "illumined life and incorruption." Paul did not mean to tell Timothy that Jesus first revealed the doctrine of a future state; but only that he placed it in a more conspicuous light, by his explicit teaching and his resurrection and ascension to heaven. This was proclaimed "by the gospel" to the heathen who had well-nigh lost the primitive

revelations concerning a future state. Thus, when addressing the Athenians, he said, “God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter.” (Acts xvii. 31, 32.) But when he addressed the Jewish Sanhedrim—“perceiving that the one part were Sadducees and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee:

of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both.” (Acts xxii. 6–8.) So in his apology before Agrippa: “I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come; for which hope’s sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?” (Acts xxvi. 6–8.) It was consistent enough for the Sadducees to deny the resurrection of Jesus; but the other Jews ought not to have done so, as they believed in the resurrection, while they censured Paul for basing it upon the resurrection of Christ.

So futile are all the attempts to prove “that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.”

Chapter III. Abolition of Jewish Ceremonial and Civil Law.

545

The third section states that “the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.”

§ 1. Summary of These Laws.

These laws are well summed up in the Appendix to the Wesleyan Catechism, No. 2, as follows:

Q. What were the special laws which God gave them [the Jews] relating to their religion as a Church?

A. Many rules about the worship of God, about their priests and sacrifices, about sprinkling with blood, and washing with water, and about holy times and holy places.

Q. What was the chief design of these ceremonies?

A. Partly to keep them from the idolatry and evil customs of other nations, and partly to prefigure the blessings of Christ and the gospel.

Q. What were their peculiar laws, considered as a nation?

A. Such as related to their peace and wars, to their houses and lands, to their wives and servants, to their lives and limbs.

Q. Why did God himself give them such particular rules about these common things?

A. To distinguish them from all other nations as God’s own people, and to show that he was their king as well as their God.

§ 2. The Ceremonial Law Temporary.

The temporariness of the ceremonial law, and its restriction to the Jews as a people, are stamped upon its very face. It would necessarily cease with the dispensation to which it belonged. It expired by the law of its own limitation. When the Jews ceased to be God’s peculiar people, they no longer needed this “law of commandments contained in ordinances” to hedge them in from all

other nations. There is now no difference between Jews and Gentiles: “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law

of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.” (Eph. ii. 14, 15.)

Καταργέω[1] does not here mean to abolish by any direct repeal: so that there is no contradiction between this passage and Matt. v. 17: “Think not that 1 am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.” “To destroy” means to cancel, to annul by formal legislation. “To fulfill” means to complete. If the Old Testament, as a system of religion, had been of any other than of divine origin, Christ would have destroyed it, and not have completed it. If it had been complete in itself, Christ would not have destroyed it, and could not have completed it. But it was divine, and therefore Christ would not repudiate it; yet incomplete, and therefore Christ came to complete it. The New Testament is the complement of the Old. Specific political statutes of the Mosaic code are, indeed, no longer binding, as the theocratic commonwealth to which they were adapted has passed away. But Christ did not cancel even these: he obeyed such of them as were practicable in his time, and left them all on record, to guide Christian legislators by their spirit, if not their letter, to the end of time. The ceremonial code was canceled by Christ in no other sense than that of fulfilling it. The outline sketch of the painter may be said to be destroyed when it is filled out in the perfect picture. But though, in the nature of the case, the Levitical rites are no longer binding, yet Christ did not formally annul them: they were, of course, virtually annulled by their fulfillment in him—which is the meaning of such texts as Eph. ii. 14, 15; Col. ii. 14; Heb. vii. 12, 18; ix. 8–11; x. 1–9—nevertheless the Levitical law is still of use in illustrating the gospel system, which it prefigured. In like manner Christ completed the prophecies, by verifying them in himself: not by setting them aside, as if they were lying oracles.

It is scarcely necessary to state that when it is said that these ceremonial laws were to remain in force “forever,” to be “everlasting,” “perpetual,” “for all generations,” and the like, the meaning is that they were to last throughout all that dispensation:

they were to last as long as they could last, in the nature of the case. Such expressions frequently bear that meaning in Scripture, *e. g.*, Gen. xiii, 15; Ex. xxi. 6; Num. xvii. 19; Isa. xxxiv. 10, 17; Gen. xvii. 8; xlix. 26; Ex. xl. 15; Heb. iii. 6; Ex. xxix. 9; Lev. iii. 17; xxiv. 9; xxv. 34.

The so-called Sacraments of the Jewish Church, Circumcision and the Passover, naturally gave way to the Sacraments of the Christian dispensation, Baptism and the Lord's-supper. These Sacraments in their highest intention bind those who receive them to regard every thing prescribed in the dispensations to which they respectively belong. Hence the Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians argues against the "Judaizers" of his day, who wanted to impose circumcision upon the Gentile converts to Christianity: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." (Gal. v. 2, 3; *cf.* vi. 12–15.) That was the reason that Paul would not circumcise Titus: "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised; and that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." (Gal. ii. 3–5.)

But, it is objected, Paul did circumcise Timothy, who was also a Greek, at least by his father's side. But in this case he acted on the principle: "Unto the Jews became I as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews." (1 Cor. ix. 20; *cf.* Acts xxi. 23–26.)

There was no compromise of principle in this, as the design was not to bind Timothy to the observance of the Mosaic law, nor to procure salvation thereby, but to give him access to the Jews in the exercise of his ministry: Luther said he would be willing to submit to it for a similar reason. But when the Jews insisted upon circumcision and observance of the Mosaic law, as necessary to salvation, Paul, as we have seen, sternly refused to comply with the requisition. How nice, how wise, how consistent, was this casuistry!

You may as Jews in nationality, though Christians in religion, practice circumcision, make Nazarite vows, and observe the ceremonies pertaining to them, attend the three annual feasts, keep

the seventh-day Sabbath, abstain from swine's flesh and other prohibited food, and do other things which have an ethnical as well as a religious character, provided you do not observe them as necessary to salvation and as conflicting with the law of Christ, and do not impose them as obligatory upon others. The Jewish Christians did all these things to a less or a greater extent, till after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple.

§ 3. The Political or Civil Institute.

It was very much the same with the political institute. The laws of this sort, which we have noted, belonged to the Theocracy, and as that ceased at the coming of the Messiah, the legislation peculiar to it ceased also. Many of the political laws were adapted to a miraculous dispensation such as those of the Sabbatical year, the Jubilee, attendance upon the three annual feasts, the laws of war, such as the non-employment of cavalry, etc. It would be preposterous and fanatical to graft these upon any political code now extant. Capital punishment was to be inflicted upon Sabbath-breakers, idolaters, and other offenders, because their offenses were "presumptuous sins" against God, viewed as the *King* of Israel. In many cases he himself by miraculous means inflicted the penalty as, on the other hand, he wrought miracles to reward those who distinguished themselves as loyal subjects of the Theocracy.

These political laws made a distinction between "the people of God" and other nations. The Israelites were commanded to liberate their slaves, being Hebrews, in the year of release; but they were allowed to hold their slaves, being heathen, during life. They were not allowed to give and take usury, that is, interest, among themselves (Ex. xxii. 55; Ps. xv. 5; Ezek. xviii. 8); but they were allowed to lend on usury (which always means "use," or interest, in the Scriptures) to the heathen. But who would think of grafting any such distinctions upon our political codes? They belonged to a theocratical government, and to a peculiar dispensation, which had its checks and compensations, maintained by immediate, and not infrequently miraculous, interpositions of divine providence.

How absurd then for Puritans or others to attempt to incorporate the political statutes of the Jewish commonwealth into the political codes of Christian nations!

Must our legislators allow of polygamy and divorces for slight causes, because Moses allowed it on account of the hardness of the people's heart—that is, their dullness and ineptitude? Christ and his apostles have repealed such legislation. Must a man marry his deceased brother's widow, when the reason for this levirate law passed away with the Jewish nationality? Must the peculiar legislation connected with slavery be introduced into Christian codes, when, though slavery has not been forbidden, but legislated for in the New Testament, it has either been abolished or greatly modified by the necessities of Christian nations?

We make the best use of Jewish jurisprudence when we carefully study the condition and character of the people for whom it was provided, and the eternal principles of equity and justice which underlie the entire system.

---

1. Thayer defines the word (1) to render idle, unemployed, inactive, inoperative; to cause a person or thing to have no further efficiency; to deprive of force, influence, power; (2) to cause to cease; put an end to, do away with, annul, abolish; and under this latter meaning Eph. ii. 15 is cited.—T.↩

Chapter IV. Eternal Obligation of the Moral Law.

550
The fourth section of this article asserts that “no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.”

§ 1. The Ten Commandments.

These commandments are those spoken by God on Mount Sinai, and contained in the two tables of the law, written by the finger of God, and deposited in the sacred chest in the Most Holy Place: hence called “the ark of the covenant.” These are called the Decalogue, from the Scripture designation “ten commandments:” Hebrew: “words.” (Ex. xx.; Deut. iv. 12, 13; v.; x. 1–5.) Similar precepts, found in the Pentateuch and other parts of Scripture, are, of course, comprised in the moral law, which is thus summarily comprehended by Christ: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” (Matt. xxii. 37–40.)

§ 2. Moral and Positive Precepts Discriminated.

These commandments differ from those of the ceremonial institute in that they are *moral*, while the others are *positive*. By moral here is meant laws the necessity of which are seen as soon as they are promulged: they belong to what is called the unchangeable fitness of things; as when it is said, “Thou shalt not steal,” everybody sees the necessity of such a law among all people and in every age. A positive law, on the contrary, is one the reason of which is not self-evident, as circumcision and baptism, sacrifices, and the like. The fourth commandment, or, as Romanists and Lutherans reckon, the third commandment, enjoining the sanctification of the Sabbath, is considered by some positive and

not moral; but it is moral, in its essential character; for every one sees the necessity of setting apart a

551

special time for holy convocations to worship God and to cultivate the social and religious feelings, as well as to rest and recreate the body and mind: so far it is moral. That precisely one day in seven, and that the last or the first day of the week, should be so appropriated, is of course positive; for, though experience may prove that that much and no more of our time is needed for sabbatical purposes, yet it is not self-evident, like the other. It is nevertheless proper to place the law of the Sabbath among the moral precepts. It was proclaimed at the creation, and thus was evidently designed for all men of every age; and this is not at all affected by its being subsequently made a sign between God and the Israelites, because other nations, having gone into idolatry, neglected the law of the Sabbath, though they do not seem to have entirely forgotten it. False religions may do without it, but the true religion never can. Hence when the Holy Spirit transfers all the other nine commandments of the Decalogue from the tables of stone to the fleshly tables of the regenerate heart, he does not omit the fourth commandment. Even Quakers and others who do not consider it binding upon Christians nevertheless observe it, and, in many instances, from the force of internal suggestion, the instincts, so to speak—rather, the gracious affections of the renewed nature—with more sacredness than many who orthodoxly recognize its binding force.

It needs no argument to prove that all the other nine commandments are moral in their nature, and of perpetual obligation.

§ 3. The Ten Commandments Distinguished from the Political Code.

These commandments are distinguished from the political code of the Jews, as a principal part is distinguished from the whole. All the ten commandments are comprehended in the political jurisprudence of the Jews; some of them, as those against polytheism and idolatry and profanity and irreverence, on theocratic grounds, and the rest on more general principles, as nearly all governments interdict murder, adultery, theft, and

perjury by severe penalties. Christ and his apostles frequently refer to the moral law: expatiate on its importance, show its spirituality, assert its perpetual obligation, and set forth its important ends. (Matt. v.; vi.; vii.; xix. 16–19; Rom. vii. 12;

552

viii. 3, 4; xiii. 9, 10; 1 Tim. i. 5–10; Heb. viii. 10; James ii. 8–12; *et al.*)

§ 4. Christian Functions of the Moral Law.

Though no sinner can be justified, that is, gain the forgiveness of his sins, by keeping the moral law—

> Since to convince and to condemn
> Is all the law can do,

yet this is an indispensable service—"that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." (Rom. iii. 29, 20.) This shows us our need of pardon, which can be obtained only through faith in Christ.

Then the law will always be needed as a rule of life, and finally as a rule of judgment; for though we shall not be rewarded for the merit of our obedience—as in the sight of God it has no merit, being performed by the aid of his grace, and so imperfectly performed that it needs the atoning blood—yet it will be generously rewarded in honor of the Son, through whose merit it is accepted and by whose Spirit it has been performed.

§ 5. Antinomianism Condemned.

This part of the article is directly leveled at the Antinomians, who, as their name imports, opposed the law, as not being binding upon Christians. They are generally traced to John Agricola, A.D. 1538, who held that the law is not necessary under the gospel, that good works do not promote our salvation nor wicked works hinder it, that repentance is not to be preached from the Decalogue, but from the gospel, and the like. Some of the Anabaptists and Quakers and other fanatics, who held to the sufficiency of "the inward light"—especially those who prevailed in England during the

Protectorate, and the Calvinists of later times—also held these pernicious views. They were effectually exposed and refuted by John Fletcher in his “Checks to Antinomianism.”

End of Vol. I.